UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Washington, DC

INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL TO THE U.S. DIALOGUE ON THE CURRENT STATE OF PLAY

Auditorium DOC Building 14th & Constitution Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC

Thursday, June 10, 2004

Gilmour 281 pp.

I N D E X

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS By Doug Baker	<u>PAGE</u>
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Service Industries, Tourism and Finance U.S. Department of Commerce	5
KEYNOTE: BALANCING BORDER SECURITY AND ECONOMIC SECURITY By Grant Aldonas Under Secretary for International Trade	
U.S. Department of Commerce	12
POLICY BACKGROUND - ORIGINS OF THE LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENT By Steve Pinkos Staff Director House Committee on the Judiciary	37
FRAMING THE ENVIRONMENT: MILESTONES NOW AND IN THE FUTURE By Stewart Verdery Assistant Secretary for Border and Transportation Security U.S. Department of Homeland Security	59
US-VISIT PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION Moderator: Jim Williams Director, US-VISIT Program U.S. Department of Homeland Security	95
By Barbara M. Kostuk Managing Director, Passenger Facilitation Air Transport Association of America	107
By Elyse Wander Senior Vice President - Government Affairs and Member Programs Travel Industry Association	113
MILESTONES OF VISA IMPLEMENTATION Moderator: Catherine Barry Managing Director Office of Visa Services	
U.S. Department of State	140

	PAGE
By Theresa Brown Director, Immigration Policy U.S. Chamber of Commerce	152
By Stephen J. Trachtenberg President & Professor of Public Administration The George Washington University	163
By Marlene M. Johnson Executive Director & CEO NAFSA: Association of International Educators	172
By Leonard Karp Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Philadelphia International Medicine	181
POLICY IMPLICATIONS FOR CONDUCTING & BOOKING BUSINESS Moderator: Alfonso Martinez-Fonts, Jr. Special Assistant to the Secretary U.S. Department of Homeland Security	203
By Matt Bates Chairman VISIT USA Association - United Kingdom	209
By Shannon O'Kelly Director International Business Development New York Presbyterian Hospital	218
By Bill Connors, CTC Executive Director & COO National Business Travel Association	230
By Robert Vastine President Coalition of Service Industries	235

	<u>PAGE</u>
INTERNATIONAL DIPLOMATIC IMPLICATIONS By Patricia S. Harrison Assistant Secretary Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs U.S. Department of State	260
CLOSING REMARKS By Doug Baker Deputy Assistant Secretary for Service Industries, Tourism and Finance U.S. Department of Commerce	279

1

PROCEEDINGS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

MR. BAKER: We are running just a few minutes late, but we're trying to clear everyone in before we get started. There are still people waiting to get in. But in the interest of keeping us somewhat on schedule, we are going to begin.

In doing so, I would like to first introduce myself. My name is Doug Baker and I serve here at the Department of Commerce as the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Services, Tourism and Finance in the International Trade Administration.

On behalf of Secretary Evans, I would like to welcome you to the Department of Commerce. Thank you for taking the time to attend this important discussion on the current state of international travel to the United States and its resulting impact on the U.S. economy.

You will hear today from several speakers, including, in just a few minutes, Under Secretary for International Trade Grant Aldonas, who will provide the morning keynote examining the relationship between border security and economic security. The need to balance these issues is paramount in our collective efforts to keep this economy growing.

Following the keynote address, you will hear from Steve Pinkos, Staff Director of the House Judiciary Committee, who will set the stage for the discussions with a review of the legislative requirements driving temporary entry issues.

2.4

You will have the opportunity later to hear from Assistant Secretary Stewart Verdery from the Department of Homeland Security on visa policy considerations, so we will better know what to expect in the future and identify how these responsibilities are broadly distributed across the Federal Government.

Later in the day, we are fortunate to have
Assistant Secretary Pat Harrison. She is Assistant
Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs at the
Department of State.

Assistant Secretary Harrison will provide the afternoon keynote with a review of international diplomatic implications that result from efforts to increase border security.

You will also hear from three panels. The first panel will focus on the implementation of the US-VISIT Program. Our moderator for this panel is Jim Williams, Director of the US-VISIT Program at the Department of Homeland Security, along with panelists from industry to discuss their issues and concerns.

The second panel will focus on the milestones of this implementation. We have had a slight change in the program. Catherine Barry, Managing Director of the Office of Visa Services at the State Department, is filling in as moderator for this program in place of Deputy Assistant Secretary Janice Jacobs, who is unable to join us today due to a death in her family.

1.3

2.4

The final panel will address policy implications that affect the conducting and booking of international travel-related business in the United States. The panel will be moderated by Alfonso Martinez-Fonts, who is Special Assistant to the Secretary of Homeland Security.

We will also have representatives across a broad range of industry associations, as well as the VISIT-USA - United Kingdom chairman.

This administration recognizes the importance of economic growth. According to government data recently released by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, new jobs are growing and the unemployment rate is dropping across the country.

More Americans are working today than at any time in our Nation's history. According to this data, there are more than 138 million Americans employed today. We have created over a million jobs in the last

eight months alone. On Friday, we announced that we had created 248,000 jobs in May, 288,000 jobs in April, and 337,000 jobs in March.

1.3

2.4

Clearly, the momentum is there and we need to make sure that we are able to sustain that momentum.

In order to continue and expand this growth, we must remain vigilant to ensure that increases in border security do not stifle this growth.

The United States is a world power in trade.

As the administration has shown with its aggressive international trade agenda, both with respect to free trade agreements as well as its leadership in the World Trade Organization, trade liberalization is important to economic growth.

If citizens of our trading partners cannot travel to the United States to conduct business to get a world-class education, receive state-of-the-art medical attention, or just visit our cities and natural wonders, we are jeopardizing our economic health, not to mention the harm to our diplomatic efforts.

So, there is a balance we need to strike as a government: keep the economy growing and expanding, and protect our homeland from those who would otherwise do us harm. Both goals are important and both can be achieved through a coordinated effort.

The events of September 11 have caused many changes in the way the U.S. Government works. You have seen some of those changes by entering the Department this morning. We have all accepted a little bit of inconvenience to ensure our safety, and that is an acceptable trade-off. However, we must also work to ensure that additional security precautions do not

hinder trade and economic growth.

1.3

2.4

My office here at the Department is working with our colleagues both at State and Homeland Security to ensure that, as the government moves forward with new security measures, the impact on trade and the economy is both considered and limited.

Today, our guests from the private sector can provide us a gauge of how successful our work has been, and hopefully point out where we can, and need to, make improvements.

We have put this conference together with the goal of hearing from the broader community. We want to, and need to, hear your questions and concerns. The panel format will offer attendees the opportunity to ask questions of both private and public sector participants.

It is our hope that as you listen to the remarks today, you will feel free to ask questions.

Dialogue is important and we need to hear your concerns.

1.3

2.4

As you can see, we are also recording this conference. We plan to make elements of the conference, both in written format as well as audio, available on our Web site.

Additionally, we hope to provide following this conference a report on the findings made at this conference, and that will also be posted on our Web site.

In closing, I would like to quote a great leader who is no longer with us, Ronald Reagan, who once said, "We in government should learn to look at our country with the eyes of the entrepreneur, seeing possibilities where others see only problems."

I know that by working together we will be able to promote trade and secure our borders in a seamless manner.

Now it is my privilege to introduce Under Secretary of Commerce Grant Aldonas for the morning keynote.

Grant is uniquely qualified to provide these comments, having previously served in both the State Department in the Bureau of Economic Affairs, as well as the U.S. Trade Representative as Director of South

American and Caribbean Affairs.

Prior to his appointment as Under Secretary,

Grant served as Chief International Trade Counsel to

the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, where he
advised the chairman on all international trade and
economic matters before the committee.

So, with that, let me please welcome $\mbox{\sc Grant}$ Aldonas.

_ _

KEYNOTE:

BALANCING BORDER SECURITY AND ECONOMIC SECURITY

By Grant Aldonas

Under Secretary for International Trade
U.S. Department of Commerce

MR. ALDONAS: Thank you, and good morning. It is good to see all of you here, lots of friends in the audience, to talk about what I think is an incredibly important topic, both in economic terms and philosophically. I want to touch on both this morning.

But, first, I want to say thanks to Doug
Baker, who is, at least from the point of view of all
of you, and certainly from my perspective, the straw
that stirs the drink on this issue.

Through Doug's leadership, part of what we have done, I think our friends at other agencies will agree, is really deal our interests and your interests in at the table so that as we go through the process of enhancing our security and developing the architecture that will allow us to get the benefit both of our trade and economic growth as well as our security, Doug has really been a staunch advocate on behalf of the interests, while trying to strike the appropriate balance in terms of what we are trying to achieve.

So, Doug, thank you very, very much for your leadership on these important issues.

1.3

2.4

Two thoughts, to start. One, of course, is the irony that we got started late because we could not clear people through security. I think that is probably a pretty good point to start from what you think about in terms of the problem we have facing us.

I have found myself, having spent a fair amount of time when I was on the Hill with Senator Roth and the Finance Committee, looking hard at the Customs Service, not from the point of view of trying to find out what is wrong, but frankly to try and figure out what was right and what we needed to improve on in the Customs Service.

One thing I found as a part of that process was a real willingness on the part of Congress, when confronted with the facts, to try to come to grips with it, set the priorities that need to be set, identify the resources that need to be identified, to try to make sure that we achieve goals as long as there is some credible foundation for the request.

Part of, I think, what is the value of the conference this morning is making sure that we hear from you so that we can reflect that in our discussions not only inside the administration, but also with

Congress, about the need to build out a more appropriate infrastructure.

1.3

2.4

In my own view, it is one of the failings of government, ofttimes, that we have to have a crisis before you can gather the political forces to move, that we are responsive and reactive rather than proactive.

We are in an environment now where we cannot afford to be reactive. We are in an environment where we have to be proactive. Indeed, in this world of security, what we are going to have to do is push the border offshore.

We need to project ourselves outward into the world rather than thinking we can isolate ourselves.

At the end of the day, all of you in the business world are going to play a very, very important role in doing that.

As we have found in the past with the Customs Service in dealing with issues of FISL material and things like narcotics, the best intelligence is oftentimes gathered through the routes of trade, that whether they are terrorists or whether they are narcotics traffickers, the routes of trade are what they use to infiltrate their goods into this country, and more often than not is it the people in business

that are the folks that know what is going on on those routes of trade and can help us, and as a part of that, design the system in a way that will make us more safe.

1.3

2.4

Now, of course, the second point I want to make is not just the irony of where we started out this morning, but more philosophically. There may be a few people in the audience that are of my generation, and many of you may remember, as I did, air raid drills when I was the age of six at Bancroft Elementary School in Minneapolis, Minnesota, where we all got our little yellow raincoats out and hid under our desks and put the raincoats over us.

Even at the age of six, we thought, this is not going to work. There was that recognition that somehow we live in a world of risk. We can take what precautions we should, but fundamentally there was always that threat.

My children grew up at a point where that threat had been lifted. It is poignant with Ronald Reagan's passing to point out that we are now almost 15 years from the end of the Cold War.

During that time, the bulk of the lifetime when my children were growing up, that Sword of Damocles of nuclear Armageddon, just to mix my metaphors a little bit, that really hung over us for so

many decades was lifted.

1.3

2.4

It is back. It is back in a more virulent form because there is no stability in the system or in the threat that we face now, unlike it was in the days of the Cold War. There was some reliability of the interactions. That is not what we face now.

There is an understandable reaction to the events of both 9/11 and that persistent threat, and the instability of that threat on the part of those who are concerned for our security, to hunker down, to say what we have to do is find a way to filter out any potential risk.

Now, we all understand in business that you cannot end all risk. I want to reassure you that the folks who take care of us in Homeland Security, the Defense Department, and certainly the Department of Justice, understand that. Their goal is not to end all risk.

But I can honestly say, based on my conversations with Doug and others, that they certainly do not want another 9/11 happening on their watch. We need to find the balance to do that.

Now, my own view is, the technologies are there. The business processes are there. I spent a lot of time in private practice, for about 15 years,

dealing with major American and foreign companies and their internal compliance programs to make sure, whether it was with Customs, or whether it was foreign fair practices, or whether it was export controls, or whether it was personnel, that what they had were the systems and the tools in place that provided some assurance to the government regulators that the companies themselves were participants—active participants—in the process of securing the goals that government sought in terms of compliance. That, too, is a very, very important, and in many respects untapped, tool in the fight against terrorism that we now have to tap.

1.3

2.4

And one of the things I definitely want to encourage in the discussion today is the ability of businesses to step forward with the controls that you have internally to try and provide some of the solutions and provide some of the assurances that our friends at Homeland Security, Justice, the State Department and other places can rely on as a way of trying to build out this infrastructure.

The last thing that I want to mention, just as we start off this morning, is something Doug and I talked about this morning. What we really need to do, with your help, is build out an architecture that will

work and that will facilitate trade.

1.3

2.4

Long before 9/11, one of the things that I saw in my checkered past dealing with international trade, was the fact that we had created the openness by negotiating trade agreements around the world.

We live in a world now where, rather than the 60 percent tariffs of the Smoot-Hawley tariff in the 1930s, we live in a world where in the United States our average tariff, on a trade-weighted basis, is about 1.5 percent. That is a speed bump.

We live in a world now where technology, through changes in computing, telecommunications, and in transportation means not only that a global supply chain is possible, but it has become a competitive necessity.

If we want the full benefit of the world that we have created both through technology and the choices we have made with government policy to create a more open trade environment, we have to have the architecture and the infrastructure security that matches that openness.

To do that is going to require a willingness inside the administration, as well as a willingness with our partners in Congress, to identify the true cost and to find the tools, both technologically and in

business processes, that will help us minimize those costs, yet gain the security.

1.3

2.4

That is the advantage we have. I have to say, when I think about all of you in business, I think of what we bring to the table as Americans, and that is innovation.

I had the privilege last year of looking at the competitiveness of the American economy for about the bulk of a year, and the thing that struck me most about what business always does, is that continual drive under competitive pressure to raise its productivity.

One of the things I think we need to be thinking about together as we confront the issues of security is, what could we do that would give us both better security, as well as raise our productivity?

What are the changes that we have to make on the shop floor of security that would make the businesses processes work in a way to your advantage from the point of view of business, but also to our common advantage in terms of security, and what do we need to do to enlist allies in this?

For the first time when we negotiated an FTA with Singapore, we spent a fair amount of time focused on why Singapore should be interested in security, so

that it could sell itself in the marketplace as a port that had been certified by the U.S. Customs Service for its security.

1.3

2.4

Suddenly, that became a commercial advantage in the marketplace. The question is, how do we build into that infrastructure so that more people buy into that logic and the trade can flow?

Now, let me close, really, with one last point before I open it up for questions. It really has more to do with what we need to do with our own thinking. We do need to be creative. We do need to be a little bit confrontational about what the true costs are to this.

But the one lasting fact, and I will say, based on my own personal experience with the President, with Secretary Ridge, with Secretary Powell, with Secretary Evans, they understand one thing. If we do not strike the right balance here, what is most important to understand is the terrorists will have won.

If we cease to be engaged in the international economy, if we cease to be outward looking as

Americans, if we cease to be fully engaged in terms of who we are and what we are, and openness, whether it is in our universities, whether it is in our businesses,

whether it is in our research, we will cease to be what we are as Americans.

1.3

2.4

We will cease to be--again, I am going to refer to Ronald Reagan--"that shining city on a hill" if what we have decided to do is isolate ourselves from the world.

So the goal is not pure security or pure commerce. The question is, how do we vindicate who we are as Americans while providing for our security?

That is the balance you have to help us strike because, in the absence of your efforts together with us, like I say, the terrorists will have won.

That is something that we cannot allow to happen. For all the good that this country, and business in particular, can bring to the world, you are the face of America to most people, when we think about it. That is what happens when we are doing business.

People like to think of it in terms of profit.

I think about it in moral terms and personal terms.

You are advocates and ambassadors for who we are. That is why we are fully engaged in terms of trying to strike the right balance at the end of the day.

I know I speak for a lot of folks. I saw

Stewart just came in. This is an issue that is not

new. It is an issue that Stewart and I worked on when

we were on the Hill together. It is simply more poignant. We do need your help as a part of that process in striking the right balance.

At any rate, thank you very, very much. Thank you for coming. Thank you for the wisdom you are going to bring us. Please be open with your questions and your comments. Press us. At the same time, we are going to press you.

I never leave a podium without doing what Don Evans tells me to do as a good salesman, and that is put the "ask" on you. This is a two-way street. No whining. It is the sort of thing where we really have got to get the pragmatic solutions here.

That is why we need your help. But it is also why we are open to that help and willing to think outside the box ourselves. Thank you very much. I am free to take any questions you may have.

2.4

1.3

MS. WALTER: Ronald Reagan was known as the Great Communicator. I'm Vanessa Walter with VISIT Florida. We are a large international destination and we have been very concerned about the visa issues and communicating. I don't think we disagree that those security measures are necessary. I think what we see happening, is not good communication around that.

1 2

So I think that some of the things that we're doing are okay, but we're hearing things like, people pick up the coldness. All these changes are based on security and fear, and we're not communicating beyond that that you're welcome.

I think people in the U.K. feel unwelcome in our country. TIA. You guys have done a great job with the facts, but people are human beings and emotionally they feel unwelcome. So, we have to address that, too. I think it's really just sitting down and looking at how we communicate to people, and people coming in through security.

I'm a U.S. citizen and I feel funny when I travel in the States. Everybody has felt that since 9/11. I think we just need to maybe look at how we are making people feel versus just telling them facts.

MR. ALDONAS: That's a good comment. Of course, this is the point where I start to push back, which is to say, what would you suggest we do?

Because, you know, particularly for those in the travel and tourism industry, one of the things you do -- all right.

I'll use a loose analogy. We've all taken a trip to Disney World, been down to Orlando. We may have taken our kids. In some respects, what would be

very helpful as a part of this process is how to address that fundamental problem.

2.4

I know that when I was standing shortly after 9/11 in San Francisco International Airport, the real problem was the fact that that airport was not built for the new security demands. It just wasn't. It wasn't designed with that in mind.

So the lines were out the door and outside to the street as they were trying to get themselves organized to grapple with the new security requirements.

And everybody in that line was bitching about United Airlines, not about San Francisco International Airport and the architecture that was dated 40 years in the past.

But part of what I think business can help us with precisely on that point, is really how do we do that? I know that there have been improvements.

Certainly in terms of the things that I see since I travel all the time, just like you, I'm starting to see things coming through where Homeland Security is putting up things that tell me what it's going to take me to get through the line, it's more open and receptive, it gives me a better sense of what the directions are and how to facilitate my way through

that. But one thing I would hope during the day is that we do get some comments about how we can improve that part of communication.

1.3

2.4

MS. WALTER: You know, we see companies that sort of have maybe different sections going off and they're not communicating together. I think, because this is all new to us, I'd say the Department of Homeland Security -- I have great hope in the U.S. Department of Commerce and the campaign that they're going to be doing in the U.K.

Everybody can be sure to get together, and the U.S. travel industry, and look at, before communication goes out, how is this going to be received, what can we say. I think a lot of people in the U.K. are concerned about privacy, and what are we going to do with that information that they give us.

I think these are more issues like trust and privacy, and just reassuring and letting people know that, in spite of all these security issues, they're welcome.

I think when the U.S. Department of Commerce works on this campaign, they're in a position to address some of that. I think we should, yes, report the facts, but also address that emotional/psychological part of a human being.

MR. ALDONAS: Again, I don't disagree. Again, I'm going to push back just a little bit, in the sense that what you just gave me was, again, a question of the perception they may have of what we do.

What I really need the help with--I'm not asking you to do it right now. I don't mean to put you on the spot--but as the day goes on, or if what we do is put together out of this conference something that does try to address that, what I would encourage you and everybody in business to be doing, is thinking about how we address that fundamental problem.

How do we make sure that, as a part of a communications strategy, what we are saying is, America is still open not just for business, we are open because that is who we are.

I appreciate very much what you're saying.

The comments about how we do that as the day proceeds will be very, very helpful.

Please.

2.4

MS. MUTNICK: I'm Gail Mutnick. I'm Director of Meetings for the American Association for Clinical Chemistry. One of our issues, is we have lots of people who come to our annual meeting, which is about 20,000 people, who want to present their work. They submit their work. It gets accepted. Then they need

to get a visa to come. We find that we get lots of people who say, I cannot get an appointment to get my visa until after the conference.

1.3

2.4

So, if you would like a concrete suggestion, I would like something to put in my brochures and on my Web site that says, if you're going to come to the United States, this is what you need to do.

This is where you need to go, this is how long it will take you, and if you have any other questions, this is who you call. Just a simple, two- or three-paragraph statement. That would help us in the meetings industry a tremendous amount.

MR. ALDONAS: It makes a tremendous amount of sense. I would also say that there are things that you can do to be proactive on that, which is, there is information available, certainly Web links, that ought to be included in your material that you send out.

The other thing that I would encourage folks to do, particularly on the academic side, which I know this is unusual and it is a very different situation in traditional research to be grappling with this, it is more common for folks who operate a cruise line to do this.

But the fact of the matter is, just like we have now done with implementing the Bioterrorism Act,

and just like we have had to do with passenger or manifests on ships of goods coming into the United States, I think we are going to have to be proactive and think ahead.

1.3

2.4

So in some respects, to the extent that what you have is an annual event where what you can do is approach the folks inside government about how to put together a system that provides some assurance, along with the process as you are awarding these grants or these invitations, that we are already cognizant of what is happening, I think the more we'll have to work on in advance, and then smooth the process when the day comes where they have to apply for the visa or they have to make their entry at the port of entry.

MS. MUTNICK: We are part of the Department of Commerce program, the International Buyers program, so we work very closely with the Department of Commerce. But it's still not quite enough.

MR. ALDONAS: Yes. But you understand what I'm saying here? It's not just working with the Department of Commerce in terms of the program. What I would do in that instance, very much, is approach us, certainly, certainly the folks at Homeland Security and the folks at the State Department where you do have these sorts of things. We're more than happy to

facilitate this.

1.3

2.4

But where you do have an annual event, what I would be thinking about as the innovation there is, there is this consistency. You're going to see it every year. You know the pattern.

If what people do is have that pattern ahead of time, people in the government then can respond to that in a way that will facilitate things when the day comes that someone has to apply for the visa.

That's an event where you can take advantage of the fact that there's a regularity to the process that you don't see with the average tourist coming over on a cruise, or things like that.

And certainly if that is something that we need to be working on in the government to try to make sure that happens, trust me, we'll do whatever we can to be helpful.

The reason I say that is, I have been struck by the fact that as I've looked at the economy this past year, about how much the sorts of things that you do with these sorts of organizations drives technological change in the United States and how much of that adds to our ability to innovate and raise our standard of living through increases in productivity.

So, it's one of the areas that I think about

not just on the tourism side, but what fundamentally drives growth in the economy and will allow us, over time, to raise our standard of living.

1.3

2.4

It's the sort of thing you do in those conferences on the research that is most critical from the point of view of what blows through the rest of the economy. That's an area where I want to see the maximum degree of openness. It's also where I think there's a minimum amount of risk.

We can take advantage of the fact that you have these regular cycles, and that the community people involved in physical chemistry is a known quantity and that you're capable of looking at that ahead of time rather than having to wait until the moment comes where someone applies for the visa.

VOICE: We have time for one more question.

MS. CARPENTIRE: Hi. I'm Meagan Carpentire with the Association of Equipment Manufacturers. We have a show, actually, every three years, which makes the process a little more difficult, since obviously the visa issues were very different three years ago. Coming up, we have about 120,000 international visitors coming.

To some extent, our staff that deals with this is being told that it's too far ahead right now to

start applying for visas for March next year, which I think is maybe not the case, from one perspective.

1.3

2.4

I think one very concrete thing that would be helpful is to go to the embassies and the consular offices that are dealing with these applications and have on a Web site the average time it takes from application to answer, and the percentage of denials so that we know, going in advance, that the average time from China is five months, the average time from Singapore is three months, the average time from Indonesia is nine months, something like that, and the percentage of denials in those countries and what they are so we can say to people, this is the percentage of visas that get denied, this is how long the average takes.

Make sure you plan outside that average, even if you're just thinking about coming right now. That would be a very concrete thing that I think would be at least helpful in helping us make some of those arrangements.

MR. ALDONAS: It is a very good idea. One thing that I would ask -- don't let the microphone get away from her. One thing that I would ask is, in that situation, are you dealing with companies that are repeat customers? Are they coming every three years?

1 2

MS. CARPENTIRE: It depends. It depends on how good we are at expanding. We also go through the International Buyers program at the Department of Commerce, so every year we can --

MR. ALDONAS: I'm sorry. Rather than saying it depends, can you give me an idea what the percentage might be?

MS. CARPENTIRE: No, I really can't. It's 120,000 people. It's hard for me to know in Washington with the repeat, especially nine months in advance.

MR. ALDONAS: No. Right. Well, the companies, though. What's the universe of companies that might be regular participants? The reason I'm probing that is, when you have a situation where companies are going to be regular participants, one of the things that I want to encourage our business community to be thinking about -- and the onus wouldn't be on you so much as the companies who are going to participate, although you could be a device for communicating to them the needs from a security standpoint of what you're going to face to have them there, as well as what we're going to face.

A very sound internal compliance program ought to reflect the visa requirements. That's just standard, right? It's harder for smaller companies.

If there are ways we can try to facilitate it for smaller companies, I'd like to get some ideas out of the business community.

1.3

2.4

But the truth of the matter is, with a good internal compliance program, one thing they would know in advance, it's who are the likely candidates that are going to be participating in that sort of program.

One of the things I think we increasingly need to do, is make sure we're operating within an environment where, as is traditionally true on the enforcement side, we do rely on the good actors in the business to reduce the risks so we can concentrate our resources on the bad actors, or the unknown quantity.

So to the extent what you've got every three years is a group of companies that are regular participants, their internal programs help them identify in advance who are likely to be the people, and in one sense we can start to think about how you engage in something of a pre-certification program.

So, for example--I'm going to take this a little out of your context, but just to make the point to the audience at large--within the framework of the immigration laws, there are some standard visas that businesses use on a regular basis that could provide a benchmark for a compliance program that would help

facilitate working with the folks at the Department of Homeland Security, L-1 inter-company transfers.

1.3

2.4

It's clear that when a company is engaged in global trade and is going to be engaging in intercompany transfers on a regular basis and that's a need within the company, or simply to make sure that their salesmen can get in abroad, we need to find a way to hook the internal compliance program with our security needs, not just the application of the visa, have you met the requirements for entry, but with the security side as well.

It probably has to reach as far as us giving you the information to provide to your repeat customers so they're thinking along those lines as well.

Increasingly, it's just like I said. I think on this area of visas, we're going to have to be thinking a step ahead, like people now have to do with airline manifests and with cargo as well.

To the extent that we can engage in something of a pre-clearance process to facilitate that, that's the world we have to build in. We have to build in very quickly, because I worry that what we're going to do is see the position that we have economically erode until we have this sort of facility in place.

So what I'd encourage you to do is think about

that as the day goes on and make sure that, in your own minds, you're thinking about, what do we do in business that would link up with the security needs of the Nation, and how do we try and communicate our ability to police ourselves?

Because in any environment, what you'll find when you're talking with security and enforcement people, they'd be happy to have resources freed up to actually focus on the bad actors and the unknown risks. The more extent that we in the business community can build out a platform that they can feel comfortable with that environment, I think the better off we'll be in terms of trying to sort out these problems.

Thank you very, very much. I appreciate it. And thanks for your help.

2.4

1.3

MR. BAKER: Mervis Industries in Doug Baker's office. It is my pleasure to introduce our next speaker, Steve Pinkos, of the staff of the House Judiciary Committee. He will talk about the legislative basis underlying all of the issues that will be touched upon in today's conference.

Steve is widely recognized as an expert in this field. He first joined the committee staff in 1998 following three years with Congressman James

Sensenbrenner.

Since 2001, Steve has served as the Deputy

General Counsel, and then Staff Director of the House

Judiciary Committee, managing the Majority staff of 50

and playing a critical role in developing and executing
the committee's overall legislative oversight and
political agenda.

This includes responsibilities across a broad range of issues, including intellectual property, free trade authority and trade agreements, antitrust, and, of course, immigration law.

I am sure he is well known to you all, so please let's welcome Steve Pinkos. Thank you.

1

POLICY BACKGROUND

2

ORIGINS OF THE LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENT

3

By Steve Pinkos, Staff Director

4

House Committee on the Judiciary

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

MR. PINKOS: Thank you very much. It's good to be with you all this morning. Thanks to everyone with the Commerce Department for setting up this gettogether and discussion of these important issues that are facing our country.

There has been, of course, much mention of Ronald Reagan already here this morning. We do face some unique issues, as has already been mentioned, regarding basically post-9/11 and trying to balance the interests between terrorism and security, and of course our economic interests.

I think the Bush administration and the folks up on Capitol Hill have been quite cognizant of that balance and are trying to address the unique challenges that really are not new, but certainly heightened post-September, 2001.

With the atmosphere on Capitol Hill right now, again, trying to address that balance from the House Judiciary Committee's perspective--I work for the Chairman, Mr. Sensenbrenner on the House side--the committee does have jurisdiction over all of the

immigration issues pursuant to the House rules, which reflect the powers of Congress from the constitution, not only the immigration and naturalization issues, but visa issues as well.

1.3

2.4

For many people in Congress, they do not draw much distinction between naturalization issues and actually immigrant visa type of issues. To them, it comes down to, how many people are we admitting to the United States, will they be affecting American jobs, et cetera.

But from the Judiciary Committee's perspective, as many of you know, one of the seminal pieces of legislation that was passed in the last couple of years is the Border Security Enhancement Act of 2002, which has some new requirements placed for visas and passports of people coming into the United States.

The committee has also, as Stewart is probably aware, who will be speaking next, I believe, and previous to that the Department of Justice, Chairman Sensenbrenner believes strongly in aggressive oversight of the agencies and the executive branch that are implementing the laws that Congress passed and the committee is looking very closely at the US-VISIT program and the Transit Without Visa program, and all

of the actions and activities of consular affairs offices worldwide.

1.3

2.4

The chairman believes it's a very important role of Congress to actually follow through on the laws that have been passed to make sure they're being implemented in an appropriate fashion.

He travels around the world and meets with a lot of the consular officers. He meets with 20 of his businesses back in Wisconsin, business constituents as well as individual constituents who have immigration-related issues. So, he is well-versed in these issues, as some of you probably have recognized by attending various events around town.

But I'll try to be relatively brief here now so you all can maybe ask some questions about things that are pending. But I think most immediately what is pending before the Congress is a bill to extend the requirement, for at least the waiver countries, to have biometric identifiers on their travel documents.

The House is scheduled to take up legislation next Monday, which would extend that requirement out for one more year, to October 26, 2005, to give the participants in the Visa Waiver Program another year to put into place those requirements.

It is my best guess that that bill will pass

on the House floor this coming Monday. Of course, it will be over to the Senate. The chairman, and I think most of the members of the House, recognize that this bill is important to provide the travel and tourism industry with some degree of certainty that these foreign countries have some certainty and the folks can make their plans for conventions and such.

1.3

2.4

The chairman will be urging the Senate to take up that legislation very quickly. Some folks have talked about a two-year extension. Some people, frankly, do not think there should be any extension whatsoever.

But the chairman believes strongly in the oneyear extension, or actually believes that should be the
path of least resistance as well in the Senate, and
once the bill clears the House, he is encouraging all
efforts on the Senate to quickly take that up so that,
again, there is not this question mark hanging over the
industries throughout the rest of the summer and into
the fall. It's something that could actually, if
considered expeditiously in the Senate, be on President
Bush's desk by the 4th of July recess.

Of course, there are many other visa categories that are issue now. For H1-Bs, of course, the cap has already been hit for the year. The H2-B

visas, the cap has been hit for 2004 already.

1.3

2.4

There are various proposals to deal with that. The observation from the House side, and I think
Chairman Sensenbrenner right now, is that the most active consideration of raising those caps is taking place in the Senate right now. As a general observation, the House is probably much more likely to consider new legislation if it actually comes over from the Senate first.

The reason I make that observation is, just with the Judiciary Committee, the committee that I work for, there are least 25 bills that have passed this particular Congress that are sitting in the Senate that have not even been addressed yet.

So, some members of the House think it's rather futile to add to that list because it would just be, as I have heard some members say before, sort of stuck in the graveyard or the embalming parlor, or whatever sort of analogy someone wants to use, over there in the Senate.

But, conversely, though, if something comes over, then the House is much more apt to act, knowing that if the House takes action it will be on the way to the President.

The politics are a little more difficult in

the House. I mentioned H1-B, H2-Bs, L visas, P visas, O visas. All of those different types of visas are being talked about right now, specifically with the summer coming up on H-2 visas. People are concerned about theme parks, major league baseball is concerned about not being able to fill up some of their lower minor leagues.

1.3

2.4

So they're all issues that are sort of on Congress' radar screen, but at this point there is no, except with the biometric identifier legislation, real critical mass to push either of those over the edge.

I'd be more than happy to take questions on those in a moment and address any specific ideas or thoughts that you all have.

There really is a political tension, though, and it's more pronounced in the House of Representatives, on immigration issues. As I said at the beginning, this extends even to visa issues.

There are some people that would along with just about anything, and there are people on the other side of the spectrum that feel like not only our naturalization policy, but our visa and immigration policy, is quite generous already, and there's people in the middle. That's just within the Republican party.

I mean, there's still issues on the Democratic side of the aisle as well, and Republicans share some of these concerns, whether it's job issues — thankfully, due in no small part to the work of President Bush and this administration, the economy has been picking up.

1.3

2.4

When the economy is doing very well, it is easier to consider changes to our Nation's visa policy, as was evidenced several years ago during the high-tech boom and the H1-V visa category was hiked dramatically.

That was easier to do in strong economic times. So, as things continue to improve economically in the United States, the environment will improve for consideration of visa legislation.

But Congress is also concerned, and Stewart, again, will probably speak to this, as his department is getting the inquires from the Hill as well, and Chairman Sensenbrenner has always been very concerned about the manner in which visa processing occurs, immigration backlogs, et cetera.

Really, I think that everybody expects improvement over the next year, both in visa adjudications and watch list checks, et cetera. It's just a matter of taking time for the new policies in the new Department to mesh.

I think great progress is being made. There's a lot of attention being paid to it in the administration. We know that because of the oversight conducted from the Hill and the tough questions that they've had to answer, and look optimistic about

improvement in that area next year.

1.3

2.4

Again, still, legislative action this year will be difficult, but not impossible. There are various mechanisms by which things could be considered. It's a relatively short year. It will be compressed, especially after the conventions. Everybody is anxious about the campaigns.

But sometimes in those compressed periods are when there is quite a bit of legislative deal-making, so you never know what could happen after the beginning of September.

There are some concerns, if we discuss L visas and H1-Vs, about fraud. I think any legislation that will come forth will probably address that issue.

If you just look at what is coming out with L visa legislation, I think from your industry's perspective it's not particularly good. There are people that would like to set limits on L visas. There are people that are afraid that the specialized knowledge aspect of it is being abused. Some companies

are using it as a way to sort of act as a recruiting agency for other companies.

1.3

2.4

So, Congress is cognizant of those, and those hurdles will have to be addressed at the very least when and if that legislation comes before Congress.

I know I can't speak authoritatively about what the Senate is up to, but I know that Subcommittee Chairman Chambliss, Chairman Hatch and Ranking Member Kennedy are working and have had discussions on H2-B visas. I'm not sure where they'll go.

Congressmen Goodlatte and Delahunt have bills in the House, but, again, there's no critical mass at this point to consider that legislation.

Finally, as you all look forward to the future and you consider the various visa categories, I think it is worth some thought and discussion whether comprehensive reform is necessary, considering the changing dynamics in international trade and the increasing number of trade agreements with the United States, free trade agreements the United States is entering into, it might be worth some thought whether the sort of patchwork-type system we have is the best.

That's a heavy lift legislatively and will require a lot of education of members. Surely it's something that probably can occur this year. But going

into the future, your all's input is very helpful. I know the staff of our committee has talked to people about exactly where the problems lie and the best way to address it.

2.4

My only advice, really, at this point for when you speak to members of Congress, your trade associations and companies do, that you help outline a very clear idea of what the problems are, using specifics, and how the current system has either hindered, or hopefully in some situations helped, the business that you're conducting.

At this point, I guess I'd just like to open it up to any questions from you all. I'll do my best to provide a perspective from Capitol Hill and respond to anything you have.

MR. BRAHS: Steve, good morning. Thanks very much for joining us. Stuart Brahs of the Principal Financial Group. Just to follow up on some separate conversations we've had in the past.

As you know, at least from the services sector—and I'm sure others, manufacturing and so on—one of the real hassles that we confront is the problem of bringing in both company employees, as well as business partners, for training, for getting our joint ventures off on a good setting, and so on.

So I'd like to pick up on your final point, and would encourage you, the chairman, and the committee to take a look at an idea that's been floating around this town for some time, to set up an expedited visa processing system for those people who are employed by Fortune 500 companies or other organizations that has some status, that we, the companies, would bear the responsibility. Under the current INA, we can't post a bond. But if a bond could be considered, we would recommend that.

1.3

2.4

Certainly we will help sell this to your committee and on the Hill, because it seems to fly in the face of all the good work being done by USTR and Commerce to negotiate a number of trade agreements and trying to follow up on those trade agreements if we can't bring together our joint venture partners and bring them to the States so that they can see how we operate and integrate into our systems. It sort of undermines the whole objective.

So, anything we can do to assist you, the chairman, and the committee and those on the opposite side, we're more than happy to do that. Thanks.

MR. PINKOS: That's very much appreciated, and I think will be necessary to carry forth on what you've just discussed, which on its face seems to have very

strong merit.

1.3

2.4

Political realities influence the ability to achieve that, but I do think that the more education of members, particularly members that are of the committee of jurisdiction, they start working the process. They start raising it with staff, with their colleagues, and with the chairman. And like any piece of legislation, suddenly it seems very important to consider.

But I do think there are ideas floating around--my personal opinion--that have merit, considering the fact of the increased number of FTAs. With that, there's going to have to be some way to facilitate expeditiously the availability of employees from other countries to come into the United States. It's an issue that hopefully will continue to be pressed by you all so members of Congress are cognizant of it.

MR. COSADUNO: I'm Telo Cosaduno from John Min. I don't know if you're aware, we have a pretty big delegation from Europe here.

I personally must say--maybe I'm the only one--I don't know what H2, LP, whatever visa is. I have no idea. I think this whole issue here shows that you're far away from the realistic situation in Europe, for the Europeans traveling to America, and their

opinion about that.

1.3

2.4

Right now, we, as the Visit USA Committee in Germany—and I think it's the same for Italy and the U.K.—see a big problem, that there is huge confusion. I must say, after this first hour here, the confusion is not gone so far.

We don't know in Europe--and we have pointed this out for months--what is happening in September, October, and the months to follow with people who want to travel to the United States. Communication is chaotic. This is our big concern here.

The international delegation we have here today needs to go back tonight with a clear message what the situation will be after September for whatever kind of visa, L2, AOP, or XYZ, whether people have to give fingerprints, if people do not have to get fingerprints, whether pictures or taken or not taken.

It is not a problem that you come up with certain steps. It is a problem of communication.

Uncertainty is the big concern in Europe right now.

This is what we have to do. We have to go back.

This is the reason we came over here for one day with an international delegation, to get clear positions and statements, what is going to happen after September and October. Because what you do right now,

you destroy the tourism business in Europe.

I tell you my own experience. I came over yesterday and I read an article in a German newspaper of how unpredictable it can be right now to enter the United States.

I came and I'm traveling to the United States five or six times a year. I was in the plane and I thought, am I on the right way? Maybe I do something wrong at the border and they put me into jail one night and send me back.

You know, I know it's not realistic, but on the other hand, this is how people feel who travel for the first time to the United States. We have a lot of first-time travelers. We do advertising. We do promotions for the first-time traveler to come here.

One other thing. I came in yesterday into Washington. It's exactly one week ago that I traveled to New Zealand and to Australia. If you enter New Zealand and Australia, you feel welcomed by the people who are at the counter. Here, if you get to this officer, the only reason he was smiling and he was joking with me was because I told him why I'm here.

2.4

1.3

MR. COSADUNO: Because he thought, that's a very good idea, to address this point. But I saw other

people before and he was bored, he sent them back because something was wrong on their visa paper application. I think this is something we really have to address.

1.3

2.4

MR. PINKOS: I don't think anybody would disagree with that. I think the United States is coming to grips with some changed times and some changed realities, and there are new requirements that are being put into place.

Hopefully, the best efforts will be made to communicate that as well as possible through our embassies abroad, through a simple Web site through the Department of Homeland Security or Department of State. Unfortunately, some things are still in flux. As I mentioned, there is legislation that the House is going to take up next Monday.

The United States is in a unique situation that most countries around the world have not faced. Three thousand innocent Americans were ruthlessly slaughtered less than three years ago by some people that were able to exploit weaknesses in our border security policy.

There have been Belgian passports, blank ones, found in the caves of Afghanistan. There have been

thousands of French passports stolen recently in the last year. That is of concern, considering how the circumstances of 9/11 came about.

1.3

2.4

There are no perfect answers. America, as

Grant mentioned, does not want to close the borders and
put up a big wall and isolate itself from the world.

It will never do that.

I guess it's not necessarily my bailiwick to urge this or my authority as a staffer on Capitol Hill, but I think members would urge some degree of patience.

I know there has been, because this has been going on for a couple of years.

Stewart will speak, again. There is a huge new agency in the United States that's trying to accomplish a Herculean task of bringing together various departments of the government in a more coordinated, efficient fashion.

I think what happens when you do that, is in the near term there are some inefficiencies, but the people there are extraordinarily dedicated to America's security, but also continuing to foster an environment where America can be open to people from around the world and international trade. They're working extraordinarily long hours.

What people are putting in, the time in this

transition, is almost unsustainable in order to try to meet the requirements that Congress puts upon them and meet the desires and address the concerns of the American people.

Again, your concerns are very well taken, I think, by everyone that works for the U.S. Government. Communication is a key, especially in this age where it's not that difficult to communicate even as it was 20 years ago. Most people that are international travelers also have Internet access, et cetera.

So, that is a point well taken. I think you can rest assured that the U.S. Government is going to try to implement this and make this as smooth as possible, while taking into consideration the security concerns.

VOICE: We have time for one more question.

MS. KAREN: Hi. My name is Donna Karen. I'm
with NYC & Company, which is New York City's tourism
promotion organization.

I really wanted to thank my colleague for his comment, but bring it back to the topic that we were talking about beginning in the morning, which is the balance between your concerns from a judicial and visa perspective and the business concerns.

Travel and tourism is a business and my job is

1.3

2.4

numbers. In New York City, I deal with these numbers every day. It may be shocking to you and to members of this room when I say travel and tourism is New York City's third largest private sector employer.

market and 40 percent of our spending. If even 1 in 10 visa waiver travelers says, this is too much trouble, or I'm not welcome, or I don't get a visa to visit the U.S. or visit New York, I'm talking about losing some portion of that 40 percent of the jobs that are supposed by these travelers. That is critical to this country's economy.

It is that balance. It is not in the distance. It is not far away. It's every time a German, an Italian, a British, a Spanish visitor chooses not to come here, a job in my city goes away. That's tax dollars that are not being paid.

We communicate this every day. Our lobbyists communicate it. He said it more beautifully than even I could. But as this legislation comes to the front next week, it's about jobs here. It's not about other things. If we chase those jobs away, where are they going to be? So, my job is numbers, but I'm very impassioned about those numbers. So, thank you.

1.3

2.4

MR. PINKOS: The points, again, are certainly well taken. I don't think that that viewpoint is not being expressed or heard. Just watch the debate on Monday, I think. Members will be discussing that very issue and the fact that the industries need certainty, that they are important sources of jobs for the United States.

1.3

2.4

I can't speak, obviously, for every member of Congress, but Chairman Sensenbrenner is cognizant of that, and other members are. It's very difficult times for policymakers. It's difficult for the President of the United States, who wakes up every morning and gets a briefing about who's trying to make 9/11 times 10. That's a heavy, heavy burden.

At the same time, he's trying to promote policies that grow the American economy. It's a tough balance in Congress--I don't think it's mere rhetoric--trying to get it right.

I'm sure you've talked to your members, there's constituents around the country that are expressing the same views, and I don't think they're going unheard or ignored whatsoever on Capitol Hill.

But obviously more work needs to be done.

Kinks need to be worked out. Communication needs to be made. I think the people here in Washington hear that

1 message and are working towards those aims.

Thank you all very much. I appreciate it.

1.3

MS. MORANO: Hi. Thank you very much, Steve.

You had to field a lot of questions and it was helpful
to have it from a legislative point of view.

My name is Helen Marano. I'm the Director of the Office of Travel and Tourism Industries here in the Department of Commerce, working with Doug Baker.

I'm supposed to, first, do a couple of housekeeping announcements for you.

One, is that we're going to bypass the break in the interest of maintaining some form of schedule. So if you need to use the facilities or get a cup of coffee, do so at your own risk, I guess that would be.

2.4

MS. MORANO: Second, if you would help us in keeping the timeliness of the conference as best we can with your questions being a little bit shorter and/or comments being more pointed to the facts as opposed to going too long so we can accommodate as many as possible.

Now, I know that Mr. Verdery has an appointment soon after he speaks, so he does want to give enough time -- I guess I'm supposed to hurry up.

2.4

MS. MORANO: Give enough time for questions.

So, he also has asked me to be brief. His bio is in your packet. You will see that basically it's an honor to introduce him because I have worked with him personally on a task force, but he is Assistant Secretary for Border Transportation Security, BTS, for Policy and Planning.

What does that mean? My gosh, he is the one for everything. That's just all you need to know. He is omnipresent. He advocates. He does the policy on visa. He does the US-VISIT program. He serves on the Hill for testimony. I mean, I haven't figured out when the man sleeps, although maybe he doesn't. He might be like Einstein and takes one of those catnaps.

So I think in that respect it's very honorable for us to have him here to be able to set the framework for this conference now, as we have heard from both Mr. Aldonas, Mr. Baker, and certainly Mr. Pinkos.

He will bring to bear some of the forward thinking that is going on at the Department of Homeland Security and the sort of interactive, interagency activities that are going on to benefit you with those communications.

So he is a leader, certainly, but most of all

he is just a good man to work with, and I have to say to laugh with, because he definitely has a sense of humor. So, see if you can pull that out of him. Thank you.

Mr. Verdery?

1.3

2.2

2.4

FRAMING THE ENVIRONMENT:

MILESTONES NOW AND IN THE FUTURE

By Stewart Verdery

Assistant Secretary for Border Transportation Security

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

MR. VERDERY: Helen, thanks for the introduction.

I was actually just watching the third "Matrix" movie on DVD the other day. I think Neo was the one, right? That's a tough act to follow.

I'm not sure how much humor there will be in my remarks today, but perhaps a little bit. But this is serious business we're talking about. The effect that some of our security policies are having on the tourism business, on the travel business, on our international relations, it's hard to think of something more important than that.

So I'm going to try to keep my comments relatively brief so we can take some questions before I've got to run off to a videoconference with the Europeans on one of our favorite issues that I'm going to mention here in a second.

But I very much appreciate the opportunity to be here today with so many of our good partners. It's not only government officials like Mr. Aldonas, Mr.

Baker, and Steve Pinkos from the Hill, but many of you in the audience who have been such good partners with us as we have come up with the security and facilitation measures that are responding not only to the increased security threat, but also maintaining, or in some cases improving, the climate for international travel.

1.3

2.4

Now, I'd be remiss if I didn't mention at least in passing the passing of President Reagan, and with everybody from President Bush to your top pundits on the tube trying to come up with pithy remarks to remember our former leader, I'm not even going to bother trying to come up with something that's going to be memorable.

But it is clear to me that his vision of America, his vision of a secure world plays right into what we're talking about here today, allowing people to travel freely, allowing the economy to flourish. These are things obviously that were on his agenda, and they remain on our agenda today.

In that somewhat sad vein, I also wanted just to point out, we are all very saddened to hear this week of the death of the brother of Deputy Assistant Secretary for Visa Services Janice Jacobs at the State Department in Saudi Arabia earlier this week.

I know Janice was supposed to be on the program later today, and I do not believe she will be here. She's been at the forefront as part of our team to protect our country and our economy, and we of course pass along our prayers at this difficult time to her and her family.

1.3

2.4

Janice and I, along with many others you will hear from today, have been working closely on the topics that are in play. I think that's the title, "The Current State of Play."

Everything I'm about to tell you is in play.

We are, in many ways, I'd like to think, about half-way through the revolutionary changes that are necessary and possible in how we decide how a prospective traveler is admitted to this country and how he or she should be screened and vetted along the way.

If you think about the places where a would-be traveler interacts with our government, almost every single one of them has changed since 2001. We're talking about the visa process, we're talking about international flights, we're talking about ports of entry, we're talking about a departure.

All of these things have changed in less than three years, and man more changes are in store. Our investments in better and more comprehensive watch

lists, better data sharing, and advanced technology are making it much more likely that we are going to be able to identify a terrorist or a criminal. As these capabilities improve, the need for more dragnet, or kind of omnibus programs should, and will, subside.

1.3

2.4

I'm going to take just a few minutes to talk about visa policy, the visa waiver program, international aviation, and US-VISIT in just a minute. But, again, just for a second, I'll go over my role.

I run the BTS Policy Office, advising Under Secretary Hutchinson and Secretary Ridge on everything from immigration, visas, cargo and international commerce, international trade, transportation security, drugs, and a few other things.

These are all things that are implemented on an operational level by Customs and Border Protection, the Transportation Security Administration, US-VISIT, and the other BTS agencies.

I can tell you that right now no issues are more in play than the question of facilitating legitimate international travelers. The United States is proud to be a country with open doors. There is an overwhelming number of visitors who tend to come to the United States and tend to come to vacation, study, conduct business or research in the United States, and

then return home.

1.3

2.4

We have to facilitate the ability of these persons to enter the U.S. to enrich our society, to improve our economic competitiveness, and to spread our democratic traditions.

There is the old Yogi Berra line about one of his favorite restaurants, that nobody goes there any more because it's too crowded. That kind of word-of-mouth from the Yogis of the world to prospective students, scientists, tourists, or business partners telling them no when they want to come here, whether it's a particular visa application that's been denied or because they just think it's too hard to get here and don't even bother to try, would have a devastating effect on our economy in the short run and in our foreign and homeland security affairs in the medium and long term.

Having come directly from a company that owns a few theme parks, I understand the impact that government policy can have on the travel business.

So what are we doing? I've entitled my remarks—this seemed like a good idea at 2:00 in the morning when I wrote this down last night. I'm not sure—"How Do We Find a Terrorist Needle and Facilitate the Traveler Hay?" All right. We won't use that one

again.

1.3

2.4

MR. VERDERY: Nonetheless, we are doing quite a bit, and I'm going to go through a couple of things.

First, visa policy. As you know, the administration has made a number of significant changes to visa process and entry screening requirements since 9/11 to provide better security in light of the revised threat over national security.

New regulations were issued last year that limit waivers of personal appearance for non-immigrant visa applications to just a few circumstances, such as diplomats. This, of course, is where we collect the biometric information that we need to operate US-VISIT.

In coordination with the State Department and the Justice Department, we have put in place a number of interagency security checks for certain groups of visa applicants from certain places, and I'll talk about those a little more in a minute.

Under the Homeland Security Act, our

Department has assumed lead responsibility for
establishing visa policy and begun stationing employees
in sensitive areas to assist consular officers in their
duties.

Subject to certain important exceptions, DHS

can establish visa policy and has the final authority over the State Department-initiated visa guidance concerning--and I've got to read this--alien inadmissibility, classification and documentation, place of visa application, personal appearances at interviews, visa validity periods, and the visa waiver program.

2.2

2.4

Within DHS, visa policy is generally developed by my office within BTS or Office of Policy and Planning, and by the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services' Office of Policy and Strategy.

BTS focuses on the security reviews necessary for all travelers, while USCIS is responsible for reviewing visa applications required to prove their eligibility for certain visa categories.

Over the past couple of months, my staff and I have conducted, along with CIS, a comprehensive review of the existing immigration laws, regulations, and policies that predated the creation of our Department to ensure that our immigration goals, policies and laws are properly aligned in relation to visa policy and visa issuance.

We have called on some of our best staff in the US-VISIT office, CVP, from ICE, from the interagency process, to bring our best thoughts to the

table on how to aggressively effectuate change in this area.

1.3

2.4

Senior DHS leadership, everybody from the Secretary on down, has been meeting with numerous private sector groups and educational concerns to discuss their concerns and talk about policies that have an impact on business travel, international students, and scientific research.

I'm going to gloss over the statistics which have already been brought up in turn, but we recognize the seriousness of these issues.

We have listened, and over the next few months DHS is going to be working quite closely with the White House and our interagency partners to implement changes to programs like Visa Mantis and Visa Condor, which are causing unnecessary travel delays, while looking at new ways to facilitate travel through the use of biometrics and other advanced technology.

We're going to build upon the US-VISIT system to create a seamless process that will not only facilitate travel, but ensure the integrity of our immigration systems.

We are taking a fresh look at old doctrines like reciprocity and the customer service aspects of visa issuance, and we're going to try to bring to bear

a new degree of transparency to those who need to apply for a visa and how that's being processed. This is a comprehensive review and will bear fruit in the near future, but I will leave that for now.

1.3

2.4

The visa waiver program, discussed earlier by some of our speakers, is a vital program facilitating international travel to the U.S. It was established in 1988 under a pilot program and applies to people who are coming for less than 90 days for business or pleasure.

I think last year we were looking at about 13.5 million visitors traveling under the visa waiver program. That's about 46 percent of people coming to the U.S.

Now, we've always had concerns about security vulnerabilities for visa-free travel. This is especially true now that our visa process is so much better or so much more secure.

The legislation and subsequent amendments, though, have things in place to provide security for the visa waiver program. Applicants have to have a machine-readable passport.

At some point they'll have to have a biometrically enhanced passport. I'll talk about that in a second. The countries themselves are reviewed

every two years to assure that they're meeting statutory requirement or statutory criteria for the program, and we're working to have those country reviews done throughout the rest of this year.

1.3

2.4

We had a very unfortunately report from our Inspector General a few weeks ago talking about how these reviews were not happening. Indeed, they are happening. We have people actually in those countries as we speak doing these country reviews. I can assure you, these are not going to be a cursory process.

We are going to be asking very tough questions about each country's eligibility and compliance with the statutory criteria, and some of those important ones are a low non-immigrant visa refusal rate, a low immigration violation rate, i.e., overstays, the fact they have the machine-readable passport program in place, and an assessment of how that country is cooperating with our law enforcement and anti-terrorism investigations and other concerns, as well as, perhaps most importantly, their compliance with the requirement that lost and stolen passports are reported to us so that we can put those into our lookout systems.

A very important aspect of visa waiver, as was mentioned, was the biometric deadline. Steve talked about it in his remarks a little bit and I won't get

into it in great depth, except that the Department does believe that this deadline has to be extended. The countries are not going to be able to make it, through no fault of their own, as there are technical challenges. It is not a question of will.

1.3

2.4

The disruption would be intense were this deadline not to be moved, and in some ways I'm not sure who has the worst of it, whether it's the foreign travelers who then have to get a visa, or us, because we have to put people overseas to try to handle the visa workload an the economic impact would be quite devastating.

Secretary Ridge testified before the House

Judiciary Committee last month and before the Senate

Judiciary Committee yesterday about these issues, and

again, the Department and the administration in general

remain quite committed to trying to have this deadline

moved.

We're going to continue working with the Congress on this and we're very appreciative of Chairman Sensenbrenner's willingness to move this legislation guickly.

We need to continue the ability of visa waiver nationals to travel to the United States visa-free. At the same time, we're going to plug the security hole

for visa waiver travelers by enrolling them in US-VISIT, starting at about approximately 120 days.

1.3

2.4

Now, for passengers arriving by air or sea, we're working quite closely with our partners on approving standards for travel documents, aviation security, and the exchange of watch list information.

We're trying to go to more individualized review and it's the biometric that allows us to do that. By individualizing the process through biometric collection, we can be more confident and secure about our particular admission and screening decisions.

To do this, we have to work quite closely with KO and other international bodies, with our partners in the G-8, on a bilateral basis with countries like the U.K. and others, and we're going to get there. We are working these issues and it takes time, but we're going to get there in terms of improving the security of travel documents.

Now, this is just one part of our layered approach to enhancing aviation security. There is no single bullet here. The layered approach includes the visa enhancements, appropriate use of airline passenger data, the US-VISIT system, and traditional airline security measures such as cockpit doors, or better cockpit doors, and air marshals on certain flights.

1 2

Now, I'm happy to report that our Department has just signed a very important agreement with the European Union a couple of weeks ago that permits the legal transfer of so-called passenger name record information data from airlines flying from the EU to the U.S.

I was the lead negotiator for the government on this, a long and torturous process, over a year long, to try to thread the needle between the European privacy laws and our statutes that require this information for incoming passengers.

I have to admit, though, when I first started at Homeland and this issue first showed up on my desk, I really just couldn't understand why the Europeans were so worried about NPR. What is all things considered saying about them? What is the problem here? Somebody quickly corrected me.

But I'm not going to belabor the PNR agreement in depth, except to say that this agreement is incredibly crucial for allowing us to vet passengers while planes are in the air, or before they take off, in certain circumstances.

Otherwise, we'd have to collect that kind of information at the port of entry, which would have a devastating impact on wait times at those ports of

entry.

1.3

2.4

It also allows us to do after-the-fact link analysis for terrorism or criminal investigations to find co-conspirators and other types of information that you only know you're looking for after the fact.

We're also working on the APIS system--this is the information on your passport and the machine-readable zone--to try to better improve the APIS-based system for vetting passengers, along with the PNR data that comes in.

We used this to great effect during the heightened threat period in December and January for the flights of interest that enabled those planes for the most part to continue to fly to the U.S., even though they were flying under a heightened threat alert, by vetting these passengers before the plane took off.

We'll be working on a revised APIS rule over the coming months to combine the legacy INS rules for passengers for immigration purposes and the revised Customs rules related to airliners and trying to put those together into a cohesive and comprehensive form, and we'll be working on that in the coming months.

I mentioned in passing US-VISIT. I know Jim Williams is on the panel directly after me, so I'm not

going to steal his thunder because he can speak to this better than I can. But it's fair to say that the VISIT system is the centerpiece of our broader advances in this area.

2.4

In many ways, VISIT is not only a system, but it's essentially a brand name. It's a system of systems, trying to collect all these various points of data collection, whether it's the students, whether it's the legal immigration side that CIS runs, whether its the State Department data collection. Eventually we'll have the exit side of VISIT.

I'm going to leave this to Jim to get into the details on the deployment schedule for this year, but needless to say this is a busy year for VISIT. We just awarded the prime integrator contract last week. We are on track to meet the land border deadline at the end of this year.

We will expand the system to visa waiver travelers in the fall, and a host of other systematic improvements based on our improvements in the watch list sharing efforts and other matters. So, I'll leave it to Jim to kind of go into the details here, but let it be said that US-VISIT is working.

It is working so well, it's almost not even remarkable when we find people with it now. Again,

it's a signature achievement for us and we're going to make it work at the land borders later this year.

I hope you'll agree after this quick overview that DHS and our interagency partners are headed in the right direction in protecting our international travel system. It's going to take continued input from our business and educational leaders to make sure we get this right.

The consequences of getting it wrong, either because a terrorist slips through our checks or because the scientific research or business ventures that do not happen, are too great. I recognize that the sketch this morning was just a few of the issues that have been raised.

We've heard about inspector courtesy earlier. There's other issues that are very viable, too. They all fit together into a comprehensive package of work that we're working on at our Department with our partners at State and other places.

I think we're headed in the right direction.

I'm proud of what we've been able to do in the first

year-plus from the Department's point of view. It's

clear that we have more to do, and we need your help to

get it done.

I thank you for listening. I look forward to

1.3

2.4

1 your questions, and would be happy to take those now. 2 Thank you. 3 MR. REDFERN: Good morning. Eddie Redfern 4 from First Choice Holidays, and also representing 5 6 Chartering En Route With the U.K. 7 I had the pleasure of listening to you speak 8 last September at the DHS conference, One Border, One 9 Move. I'd like to make a comment on it: we're still not seeing one border, one movement. 10 For example, yesterday I went through the line 11 12 on arrival at Washington and a Customs Border 1.3 Protection officer checked me through, asked me my 14 business. I said I was attending this conference. 15 Unlike my colleague from Germany, he smiled at me. then moved further on. 16 17 MR. VERDERY: That's a start. 18 19 MR. REDFERN: I then went further on and a guy wearing a Customs uniform asked the same question. 20 21 one border yet. 2.2 Another issue there. We're not getting 23 joined-up government in the sense that, as you're

aware, airlines have to supply APIS data, yet we're now

required to provide extra crew data where the

2.4

25

information we provide there is already provided on the crew visas.

1.3

2.2

2.4

The Under Secretary this morning asked for suggestions from the industry as part of this conference today on how we can improve matters. Let's try and move forward more quickly on getting one movement through.

A question. We have 100 percent whole baggage screening out of most U.S. airports now. So why do passengers have to go through a random baggage search prior to check-in? If the bags are 100 percent screened after check-in, is the pre-screening necessary?

We work, and will continue to work, with the Department. We understand the need for these security regimes and we will continue to work with you and try and provide some solutions. I'd make those comments.

If I may just ask two questions. Can you be more specific whether the Department is on CAPS 2?

Because that is very important for the non-scheduled carriers, in Europe, in particular.

And what is the progress on APIS-Plus, where we understand passengers may have to give, their first night of stay in the U.S., information that is not currently collected by the travel industry in Europe?

Thank you.

1.3

2.4

MR. VERDERY: I think I heard five questions, so I will try to keep them real quick.

On the One Face at the Border initiative, this is essentially a two-pronged initiative at Customs and Border Protection. Part of it is on the training side. We have to cross-train the new inspectors and then go back and do training for the existing inspectors that came in from INS and CBP to give them the joint Customs, immigration, and agricultural training.

So, new inspectors are getting that training. We're going back to get the old ones to get that cross-training done. That is essentially the heart of what is meant by One Face at the Border.

Of course, each airport is configured differently. In some places you have half of the process on one floor and half on the other, because that's the way they were built.

So, we will have to transition that into a single unified check-in point over time as airport configurations are designed. It's an airport-by-airport problem. I'm not sure where you came in yesterday, but that's the problem we have, different configurations and different points along the way where reviews can be done.

On the crew data and the APIS-Plus, I mentioned the regulations that are under way. There is obviously an existing APIS regulation that's in place right now, an interim final.

We're working on a finalized version of that regulation that will hopefully clean up some of the duplicative nature of some of these requirements that have come down the pike from old Customs, old INS, and TSA to try to clean those up into one version. So, I think we hear your concern there and I think we can address that one.

CAPS 2. We are continuing to work CAPS 2 to make sure we have the appropriate privacy protections in place. We have now gotten past one stumbling block which was the EU issue.

The agreement I mentioned for Customs and Border Protection allows us to use that data for testing of CAPS 2, which is an essential part of the program to make sure we can vet the international flights appropriately.

So, we are going to take the lessons learned under that agreement, and with what we're doing at Customs and Border Protection for international flights now, apply that to CAPS 2, get the privacy protections in place, and I wouldn't want to give you a time

certain of when we're going to roll out operations, but it won't be until after appropriate testing.

The last one on baggage screening, I'm not sure I quite caught the question, but perhaps we can catch up afterwards.

Next?

VOICE: Mr. Verdery, following up on the CAPS 2 question, you mentioned -- or I should say the chairman of the House Transportation Aviation
Subcommittee met with Secretary Ridge recently, and afterwards said that CAPS 2 was either dead, or that there would be major changes. I was wondering if you could give us a preview of what's coming with that.

MR. VERDERY: Where is this question coming from? I can't for the life of me find it. There we go.

I wouldn't want to comment on a private meeting that the Secretary had with the members of Congress.

All I can say about CAPS, is basically what I've said. We are continuing to make sure we have the highest level of privacy protections in place, but also the system has been around as a concept for quite a while.

In the meantime, we have learned quite a bit

1.3

2.4

on what is going on in the vetting of passengers coming in internationally. We're going to take those lessons learned, especially the ones during the heightened threat period where we were really trying to crunch manifests quickly to allow flights to take off.

1.3

2.4

We've learned a lot. We also have stood up in the Department and understand that we need to rationalize operations at our various bureaus to make sure we don't have duplicative efforts going on.

So, I couldn't commend on that conversation, but I can just tell you, we're continuing to work on it. We think we need a better domestic screening program than we have now, and we're going to continue to work on that.

MS. MORANO: We have time for two more questions.

MR. ANDERSON: My name is Richard Anderson. I represent the U.S. Council for International Engineering Practice. It is somewhat of a contrary view to many of what I have heard this morning. We're concerned with fraudulent credentials of engineering professionals that are entering the country.

Our experience shows that up to 50 percent of these credentials may be false or are unable to be verified in some manner. We believe this is a problem,

especially with the TN and H1-V visas. We would like to know who we can talk to in your Department that we can present this data to and show them our concerns.

1.3

2.4

MR. VERDERY: You can talk to me. I think in my bio it probably has the contact information. But if you talk to me or somebody on my staff, we'd be the appropriate people. I'd be very interested in hearing about the concerns you have, because that obviously would be disturbing.

MR. ANDERSON: Okay. Thank you.

MR. VERDERY: I've actually got a couple of more minutes, whatever works for you guys.

VOICE: Thank you for addressing us today.

I'm from the health care community, and that's one
thing in your remarks that I have not heard addressed
at all. But the real point I want to make is, you've
been talking about visa waiver countries predominantly
today.

Could you imagine what the situation is in a non-visa waiver country? That's what I'd like you to focus on a little bit now.

The areas of the world that we deal with primarily are not Europe, although some of us may have a large patient base from there. They're more from Latin America, Asia, the Middle East, the Caribbean.

People coming from those areas face different kinds of problems and issues.

1.3

2.4

One thing that we find, is patients coming back for treatment a second time have just as much difficulty, even though they've already had a visa to come to this country and are going through this process. We have escorts who can't get visas. We have researchers who can't get here from that part of the world.

We have students who want to go to our medical schools that can't get there, residents that can't get here. So, a host of different kinds of problems. If you could just spend two minutes in addressing some of the non-European issues.

MR. VERDERY: Sure. I mentioned it briefly. I mean, some of the programs that are in place now are having impacts on non-European, non-visa waiver countries that we need to work on, and that includes the Mantis program, which is catching a lot of scientists and students who are into scientific fields into the interagency security that can take quite a while.

The NCIRS program, which requires registration at ports of entry both in and out for certain high-risk countries, the Condor program which has the SA overview

in Washington, all these things are delaying applicants. As the Secretary has said, we are looking at "adjusting the adjustments," I think is his quote. We're going to try to figure out what works.

1.3

2.4

The enhancements we've been able to make in watch listing since 9/11 with the terrorist screening center and development of TTIC, these are making some of these old processes somewhat obsolete.

I'm not going to say they're all going to be tossed out the window. That's clearly not going to be the case. But we've had improvements in other areas that are going to allow kind of these brute force programs to be adjusted.

The NCIRS program, especially for folks, we have committed to phasing our NCIRS to subsuming it into US-VISIT as we develop the full capability of VISIT on the exit side. So, that's one thing.

Then on the multiple visa issue or the multiple trips, that's why I mentioned the concept of reciprocity. In certain cases now, we only allow one or two trips in, because that's what they give our folks if they want to go to, name a country.

We're looking at, does that make sense? Are we cutting off our nose to spite our face? We may want people from China to come in 10 times a year, and the

fact that they're not going to let our folks do the same thing in China, well that's not good, but it doesn't mean we should link the two together.

1.3

2.4

So, we're going to look at a targeted approach to reciprocity issues. Again, I think we have a good plan under way that will address your concerns, and lot of other folks'.

MS. MORANO: Do you have time for one more?

MR. VERDERY: Yes. I've got a couple of more
minutes, if that's helpful.

MS. HUDSON: Hi. I'm Jodie Hudson from the U.K. delegation of VISIT USA, over here.

Just a quick question. I understand that the U.K. is not going to be ready for biometric passports for two years. Would it not make more sense to allow that to go through for a two-year period and be introduced in 2006 so that we don't have to address the same problems that we've had to address this year with our visitors coming over? I'm sure some of my European colleagues will be in exactly the same boat.

MR. VERDERY: We had requested a two-year extension in the legislation we supported on the Hill. We think two years is an appropriate amount of time, for the reasons you mentioned. The bulk of the countries, we do not think, will be ready a year from

October.

1.3

2.4

Again, though, we need to get this resolved, because planning for this fall is under way. If Congress decides that one year or something between one year and two years is the appropriate way to go, we're going to make it work.

But, again, when we sat down and made an independent analysis of what was the most appropriate both from a capability standpoint for the foreign countries and from our needs on deploying readers, we thought two years was a good way to go and that's what we've asked for.

MR. POTTS: Joe Potts, University of Kansas.

I guess I'd like to just go back to the first comment that was made from the floor today about the communication that is perceived by potential visitors to the United State. I think you mentioned something about customer service at the consulates. I just would like to follow up on that and ask for more staff.

As you talk to people who have applied for visas, no matter what category they're applying for, the experience is universally negative and they just have such a sense that the U.S. no longer welcomes people coming to this country, and feel that that fact alone is having a great impact on people's feelings

about coming to this country.

So whatever can be done, that's our first foot. That's people's first encounter with our country. Anything that can be done to increase staff, improve the attitudes of people who are handling visa applications, would be greatly appreciated.

Secondly, I would ask, I'm just kind of curious if in your Department the fact that a fee is being used to fund the CIVAS program for student visitors to the United States and the security system that's being implemented to better monitor students, whereas there is no such mechanism in place to fund, for example, US-VISIT and international visitors coming in other categories.

It seems like a fundamental inequity to me. With education being the fifth largest service export, roughly \$13 billion a year, I just wonder what your feelings are about that.

2.4

1.3

MR. VERDERY: Wow. I feel like I'm on

Donohue. Do you remember the old show? The guy would
say something and the audience would clap.

On the second one, on the CIVAS fee, essentially we were required to implement CIVAS under a congressional mandate. There was no funding given to

CIVAS, so we have to come up with funding somehow and we decided that a fee on the students was appropriate.

1.3

2.4

Now, there obviously are visa fees or there is a fee for general visa services. US-VISIT received an appropriation from the Congress to set up their systems, because they handle not only the visa applicants, but soon the visa waiver travelers, and have other duties as well.

So, since we were given a mandate, we have to have money to operate it. We think we have come up with a relatively painless way for the fee to be collected, which is one thing.

Essentially, somebody has to pay for this and we made a decision to pay for it on the students' backs. They're the ones that are benefiting, coming in. If Congress were to appropriate money for CIVAS, then perhaps that fee would not be necessary.

On the second one, kind of the attitude, so to speak, of both the consular officials and the inspectors, I mean, these folks have a tough business. They know that every single individual that comes in to apply for a visa or applies for admission at a port of entry, once they're given the visa or the stamp of approval, essentially the U.S. Government has said this person is good to go, you've gotten the seal of

approval, that's a heavy task.

1.3

2.4

So, we expect them to take it seriously. We also believe they should be friendly about it. They should be respectful of people coming in. They are essentially customers who are trying to get into the country.

While I think our training needs improvements,
I think that the message from on high is appropriate.
We're going to continue to work with them to have that kind of message.

I will say, though, people always have to remember that the number one reason people don't get a visa has nothing to do with terrorism, Al Qaeda or whoever else. It's because of the statute that says you have to prove that you're not going to stay here.

That's why the rates of people being refused for visas hasn't really changed since 9/11. It still sits around 25 percent. The overwhelming majority of those are people who cannot prove that they're likely to leave because of ties to their country or economic circumstances.

So, again, I'm not trying to minimize the concern here. We hear it. We're working on it, and we're going to address it. But people do need to recognize that basic underlying fact that some of the

rejections have nothing to do with terrorism. So, I'll leave it at that on that question.

1.3

2.4

So maybe one more, and then I'm going to have to depart. I see one back here, I think.

VOICE: Illinois Tool Works. We've got operations all over the world. The challenge that we continue to have is getting customers here to pre-inspect a million dollar piece of equipment that we're prepared to ship, or to get employees here to be trained on our equipment so that they can go back to their home country where we're producing for those economies.

One of the challenges that we have is trying to figure out, who do we hire that we can get over here? Because more often than not, our employees are being denied visas.

MR. VERDERY: What countries are these folks coming from, mostly?

VOICE: Mostly Asia, of late. But just a few years ago, prior to 9/11, it was Northern Africa.

But I have, for example, received a transcript from an employee who had an interview, three interviews, and he was denied each time over in Asia. What I found particularly disturbing is when the interviewer accused him of buying his invitation

letter.

1.3

2.4

I don't get it. We supplied this person with original documents, signed, notarized, and he's accused of buying his documents. We provided the bonds, the training schedule. What did we miss?

MR. VERDERY: Well, it's hard to obviously speak to an individual case, not having been there. But, again, unfortunately there are cases like that. We do see fraudulent documents all the time. It's not that hard to create a fake letterhead from a reputable company, a reputable university. So, we do see that and the inspectors are asked to look into those things.

Again, that's a tough call, to sit here and second-guess somebody from afar. I would, as Under Secretary Aldonas mentioned, anyone in this room, or your clients, or your companies, or your associations, you have an obligation to do the best you can to get the right paperwork in place so when they show up to see this overworked, stressed out inspector or consular official, that they've got the best package that they can in front of them.

So we've had requests from chambers of commerce and others, somehow, can we subcontract some of our work to them. I don't know. We may, possibly. But what they can do, is to really work hard on the

front end to make sure you've got the best possible documentation, the best references, no loose ends, not cleaned up before the person goes in.

Again, it sounds like you may have tried to do that in this case, and that's unfortunate if the person was wrongly rejected. But there are improvements on your side that can make the process, in a general sense, work better, and I hope people will work on that. I'm sorry to hear about this case.

Again, I think if you look at the measures I was talking about earlier with Condor, Mantis, and NCIRS, and reciprocity and the like, the things we're looking at that should have quite a positive impact on some of the wait times and on some of the particular cases that are problematic.

So I'm going to wrap things up. The last thing I would say is, I want our office, my staff, and myself to be accessible to you all on these issues. We know how important they are both to you and to the economy at large.

So, I hope you will take us up on that, and we look forward to seeing you either up at our headquarters at the NAC or in more forums like this.

So, thank you very much.

1.3

2.4

MS. MORANO: Okay. For those of you who are scooting right now and may be coming back again, please be sure to have your badge with you. When you walk out of the building, your building badge that you were given, not just the conference badge, is going to turn blue so they're going to know that you've left the building before coming back. There are lunch places here. There's a wonderful cafeteria downstairs.

1.3

2.4

I know most government cafeterias aren't actually said to be wonderful, but this one has a variety of foods, and the Reagan Building across the way has a food gallery. I think the main thing is to make sure you have your conference badge with you when you come back so the security guard can see you've already passed through prior to this.

MS. MORANO: We're probably going to have to shorten this a little bit on the US-VISIT program, so I'm not going to spend much time on going through the biographies that are in your packets, as I encourage you, again.

But we are very pleased to have a very good panel here for you to use as part of the continued dialogue. Mr. Jim Williams is the Director of the US-VISIT Program, appointed by the Under Secretary, Asa Hutchinson, in May of 2003.

Certainly this is a new, critical initiative that leverages the evolving use of biometrics and data sharing to enhance the security of our citizens and visitors, while facilitating legitimate travel and trade through our borders.

1.3

2.4

The first phase of the US-VISIT was launched in 2004, and Mr. Williams will be very good at covering all of this program initiative effort for both entry and exit.

In response to that, or in conjunction with it, we have two esteemed panel members, both who are not shy about speaking up on behalf of the industry and interests, so I think that you'll find this a lively panel. I know that Jim is a little bit shy, so we'll have to encourage him to open up a bit, I know.

Barbara Kostuk is the Managing Director for
Passenger Facilitation with the Air Transport
Association of America, and she represents, basically,
airlines that transport more than 90 percent of all our
passengers and cargo traffic in the United States.

We're very pleased to have her on this panel, as she represents quite a wide voice and has been a very active member for the travel industry, particular for the airlines, in partnership with the efforts going on in our entry/exit procedures.

Elyse Wander is the Senior Vice President
Government Affairs and Member Relations for the Travel

Industry Association, having joined the association in

She reports directly to the President and Chief Executive Officer, and is basically responsible for providing overall direction to the government affairs, national councils, membership and development, and the human resources departments. She will provide a good voice on behalf of the industry as a whole in the U.S.

 $\label{eq:so_loss} \mbox{So, I will step aside and welcome the panel.}$ Thank you.

May of 1996.

1.3

2.4

US-VISIT PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

Moderator: Jim Williams, Director, US-VISIT Program

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Helen. Thank you for having us here today. I'm very happy to be here today with Barbara and Elyse. I also want to thank Doug Baker for inviting us to this important conference.

It is my pleasure to be here to talk about US-VISIT. I think it's already been covered quite a bit by Stewart Verdery, who we work with very closely in my office. We both report to Asa Hutchinson, the Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security, who reports directly to Tom Ridge.

I will tell you, the leadership and the interest in this program in terms of meeting our goals, from the Secretary to the Deputy Secretary down to my boss, Secretary Hutchinson, is intense, which makes my job fun. It also helps me to get done what we need to do.

Let me give you a little bit of background on US-VISIT, a little bit about the history of it, very quickly what we've accomplished recently, what our near-term deadlines are, what our longer term vision is, and also about some of the outreach efforts that

we've been undertaking.

1.3

2.4

Very quickly, the legislative history is, this is a congressionally mandated program, mandated first in 1996, amended in the year 2000 in a different law. Those two pre-9/11 laws were aimed at building an entry/exit system that would curb illegal immigration. Post-9/11, additional laws were passing influencing this entry/exit system that really emphasized the need to accelerate it to combat terrorism.

Secretary Ridge, as part of his 100 day speech on homeland security last year, April 29, 2003, took what was the entry/exit system and he personally renamed it US-VISIT. He chose that name to reflect the fact that the United States is a welcoming Nation, and will continue to do so.

He also said we will meet the congressional mandates as set forth in the law, that we would have this system initially at air and sea ports by 12/31/03. He added, on top of the legal requirement, the requirement to collect biometrics because he believed that was important to the Nation.

I will tell you about the results of this system today. We have been in operation almost six months and we are exceptionally pleased with the program. We are pleased because we are finding that

travelers do not mind doing this. We feel like, for our first phase of the US-VISIT system, we have already met our four goals for the US-VISIT system.

1.3

2.4

Let me tell you what those are. Number one, it is to enhance the security of our citizens and our visitors. We never forget that people from over 80 countries died on September 11. We want people to feel safe coming to this country.

The second goal, equally important, is to facilitate legitimate travel and trade. That is not only a congressionally mandated goal, it is a directed goal, directly from the President to the Secretary, to the Under Secretary, and to me, is to make sure we implement the system in a way that not only does not adversely impact Commerce, especially things like our \$81 billion travel and tourism industry, but to make sure we can actually find ways to speed things up.

Our third goal, as part of the original legislation, is to ensure integrity in our immigration system. We want people to come to this country. We know that 99.99 percent of the people that come here come for legitimate reasons, to study, to travel, to see friends, to see family, to do business.

We want those people to come. But we also want to make sure that those are legitimate, law-

abiding visitors, people who come to this country with the intent to follow the rule of law.

1.3

2.4

Our fourth goal, also important, is to safeguard the personal privacy of our visitors. We are proud of the strides we have made in this area, because even though the U.S. Privacy Act does not, strictly speaking, apply to foreign visitors, working with our departmental Chief Privacy Officer, the first ever federal Chief Privacy Officer, Nula O'Connor-Kelly, we decided to apply the Privacy Act and did a privacy impact assessment. I can tell you, from a privacy standpoint that is working well.

We also, within our own organization, US-VISIT, I have my own privacy officer, Steve Yonkers, who is there to address not only privacy questions, but any criticisms or complaints people might have about the system.

He's been a little bit like a Maytag repair person, because he hasn't had a lot of calls, because frankly travelers are happy with the system, as I said. They're happy that it makes them feel safer. They're happy that it's quick and easy to take a digital finger scan.

We're allowed, as Stewart said, to process quickly the hay, the good, legitimate people, and at

the same time, the system is working. We are catching bad people every single day.

1.3

2.4

As we implement this system, it's being implemented not only at ports of entry when people apply for admissions, but in conjunction with the State Department, who has been an absolutely wonderful partner. I can't say enough good about the relationship we've had with Department of State.

We are implementing the system also at the visa post, where when people apply for a visa those same biometrics are checked against a watch list. They are also, frankly, getting hits every day.

Just to give you an example of some of the people we've caught, people like a convicted rapist in Newark Airport, somebody who had not only been a convicted rapist, but had also been making terroristic threats, convicted of assault. This person had previously been deported from the United States.

We found out that he had been coming back into the United States using at least nine different aliases, four different dates of birth. The only way we caught him was through the biometric. It is a system that continues to work, so we're very proud of that.

Let me tell you about what we did to put the

system in place on January 5th. It wasn't the Homeland Security Department by itself, although I would say this is, within the Homeland Security Department, it is one of our top initiatives and it is really emblematic of what the Department needs to accomplish in terms of working across government to make sure this system meets those four goals.

1.3

2.4

But in order to meet those four goals, I want to also say thank you to our private sector partners, Barbara and Elyse, the Travel Industry Association and the Air Transport Association of America.

We work extremely closely with them to make sure that we can put in place a system that meets those goals, especially the facilitation of legitimate travel and trade.

A lot of the speakers this morning have talked about achieving the balance between security and facilitating legitimate travel. We don't necessarily see it that way. We try to see it as, it's not about achieving a balance, it's about accomplishing both of those goals at the same time.

The more we can use biometrics, the more we can use pre-registered people, that means, just like in our current systems of Nexus and Sentry that are used on our land borders where people are frequent travelers

and pre-register with us, it allows us, when they reach a port of entry, to make a faster admissibility decision and a better and more secure admissibility decision.

1.3

2.4

So we're always going to be looking at ways that we can accomplish both of those goals, in fact all four of our goals, at the same time by better technology and by better businesses processes. We are trying to work horizontally across government, taking it from the experience of the traveler.

Because I think what you saw prior to the Homeland Security Department being formed, you didn't have one face at the border. You had INS, Customs, and Agriculture. The Department of Homeland Security is working hard to make that successful, One Face at the Border.

But also, as you look at the travelers' experience, as we look across those four goals, we look across five processes, from pre-entry when somebody applies for a visa, entry when they show up, status management when somebody who comes into the country on a tourist visa wants to enroll as a student and adjust their status, and exit, and then an analysis to make sure we continue to review the system to make sure it works as a business process in the view of the

traveler, in the view of the consular offices.

1.3

2.4

We often look at the system as something where it's an information system. We want to get the right information to the right people at the right time to make the right decision. That includes sharing information on bad people and sharing information on good people. Good people are hurt when we do not share information.

We had a recent example of a gentleman, José Gonzales, a very common name, stopped at our southern land border, a high-ranking automobile executive. He was stopped because the name-based check said there were some bad José Gonzaleses out there.

It was not him. Nevertheless, that person's visa was taken away from him. Had we been able to share the information, take the biometrics and confirm this was not a bad person, that person would have been processed, hopefully, faster and easier.

Let me talk about some of our near-term deadlines. As we go into the rest of this year, 2004, I look at our program as having five major deadlines. One, is as we continue to work very closely with Barbara, we are testing more exit pilots at airports and seaports.

We are going to begin testing July 1 in

Chicago other exit alternatives. Today, we have exit alternatives that capture biometric confirmation of departure at Miami Seaport and BWI Airport.

1.3

2.4

As we go forward through the summer, we are going to be testing other alternatives at 15 additional airports and seaports. On September 30, as has already been mentioned today, we will begin including visa waiver travelers in the US-VISIT system at air and seaports.

Going to October 26, the Enhanced Border
Security Act gives us additional deadlines there in
terms of visa travelers, and also other types of
travelers that Citizenship and Immigration Services
issues documents to, such as refugees and asylees. We
have to be able to meet the requirements of that act.

We have two more deadlines. Actually, they're more internal deadlines. One's an internal deadline, one's the legal mandate. The legal mandate is to have US-VISIT at the 50 busiest land ports of entry by that date.

I will tell you today, we do not expect travelers to see much of an impact on January 1, 2005 at those 50 busiest land ports of entry. That is because the system will apply to people with non-immigrant visas and visa waiver travelers who

generally, today, at land ports of entry go into secondary.

1.3

2.4

Most of the people coming through land borders, Canadian citizens, Mexican citizens, with border crossing guards are processed in what's called primary. If they come in with a visa, they go into secondary. In secondary, all they will have is the additional about 10 seconds for US-VISIT to take place. I don't think they'll notice the difference on January 1.

As we go farther down past January 1, 2005, we are looking to try and incorporate radio frequency technology at our land ports of entry to be able to do a better job of, for instance, people with multiple entry visas that we can process those people without having to go to secondary, by capturing, at the very least, initially, their biographic information, and later on maybe their biometric information on entry and exit.

Those are our near-term deadlines. We have one other deadline for 12/30/04 for putting in systems that will better interface with Department of Justice systems.

I want to also conclude with talking about outreach. I have with me Anna Hinken and Barbara

Shipley here from our Public Relations room. Anna Hinken is our Outreach Director.

We've been doing as much as we can, working with the private sector, to try to communicate about US-VISIT, what it is, what it is not, doing that through signs, through information we give travelers, through our Web site.

I believe our Web site people have it. I hope I get it right. It's www.dhs/us-visit.gov. Is that correct, Anna?

MS. HINKEN: Yes.

2.4

MR. WILLIAMS: We also have an opt-in list serve for people who want to be kept informed about US-VISIT. If you're interested in being included in that, you can send an e-mail to Anna Hinken at anna.hinken@dhs.gov, and we will include you in all of our blast e-mails that go out.

Lastly, an offer that I often make, and it's in response to a question I heard earlier this morning, is we want to communicate as much as we possibly can about US-VISIT.

We know that's a challenge we will never meet 100 percent, but I want to offer to you all that where you want us to stand up with you and communicate about US-VISIT, we want to do that with you. Let us know.

1 2

,

Let Anna Hinken know what opportunities there are where you have regular meetings with your constituents, and we'd be glad to send a representative, myself, Bob Motkin, my deputy, somebody who will be there to help talk about US-VISIT with you. Again, we look forward to working with you all to make this system work.

It is something where we believe we can accomplish all those goals of enhancing the security of our citizens and our visitors so people feel safe in coming to this country, at the same time doing a better job of processing those legitimate people in this country and protecting our economic security at the same time, and also maintaining good relations with our international partners. Thank you.

I'll turn it over to Barbara.

U.S.-VISIT PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

_

By Barbara M. Kostuk

Managing Director, Passenger Facilitation

Air Transport Association of America

MS. KOSTUK: Thank you, Jim, and good morning,

everyone.

I do work for the Air Transport Association of America, and we represent all of the U.S. carriers. We do not represent a lot of the foreign carriers. We have a couple of co-chair partners, but it is primarily all the U.S. carriers.

Jim was correct. We have been working with US-VISIT very, very closely on its implementation. We've been working, actually, prior to DHS being formed with the Legacy INS folks on the entry/exit system that Jim mentioned earlier. The implementation of the entry portion of US-VISIT has been extremely successful and we have been very pleased.

We were very concerned at the outset. We were concerned about long lines in the Immigration FIS facilities in the airports throughout the country, and we were pleased that we were able to partner with US-VISIT last fall when they did the pilot for entry in Atlanta. Delta Airlines was a major partner in that regard and it worked very well. US-VISIT was very good

about listening to the concerns that Delta had and making changes where Delta felt changes would be useful. So, we very much appreciate that.

1.3

2.4

Since the roll out to the other airports in January, it has been remarkably smooth. I would agree with Jim, that we are not as concerned that passengers are inconvenienced.

We still remain cautious, I should say, that as more and more travelers come to the U.S. this summer and as the visa waiver passengers are added to the system on September 30, that the FIS facilities can handle the amount of traffic that is going to occur.

That is not as much Jim's issue as it is the overall DHS issue of enough inspectors to handle the volume of traffic. Though US-VISIT processes take a limited amount of time, it still does slow the process a little, for those of you who have watched it or have seen it come into play.

We remain, again, cautious that airlines are not inconvenienced, that airports are not inconvenienced, and that passengers are not inconvenienced. We want you to come here, believe me.

It's disconcerting to be going into an FIS facility and see that the lines snake around for miles and miles and miles, and that's upon entry. That's not

even going through the TSA security lines that you have to go through when you leave.

1.3

2.4

So, we really do feel your pain and work very closely with all of DHS, whether it be TSA or US-VISIT, on trying to mitigate as much as possible the processes in order to keep this country safe.

We have been very, very pleased with DHS's efforts in the One Face at the Border. Though I think one member of the audience mentioned earlier that they don't quite see that it's a seamless process and there is just one person to meet when coming into the country, in the short amount of time that they've been implementing this, it is remarkable how far they've come.

The cross-training of legacy INS and legacy Customs inspectors in the FIS facility has been really a monumental job. You're taking two cultures which are very, very different.

I'm not trying to be a government employee here, but I've worked with them for so much, and they come from totally different worlds. For them to have to join up and be partners at a time when they've looked at the world very differently, it's been remarkable how far they've come in such a short time. So, we've been very pleased with that.

With regards to the exit process, we again are partnering very closely, as Jim said, with US-VISIT on this. The Chicago pilot, which begins July 1, is going to be very interesting to watch because they're going to test three different processes, one of which we're

1.3

2.4

familiar with at BWI.

We remain concerned about some of the options that are out there, one of which is a mobile device that they're going to test at some of the departure gates. That is something that gives us a little bit of heartburn. Departure gates at U.S. airports are not designed right now to isolate outbound international passengers.

A government requirement to capture biometrics at the departure gate could disrupt the boarding process, and we're concerned that flights could be delayed. We've been assured that they won't be. But, in a word, to capture the right amount of data, we continue to work with US-VISIT to ensure that the process is as seamless as possible.

As you know, the airlines have been very involved and talking endlessly with DHS, and prior to that TSA and FAA, on CAPS 2. I know that was mentioned earlier. We have supported CAPS 2 in its development, but have been concerned about the privacy issues for

our customers and want that properly resolved before anything goes forward.

1.3

2.4

So, I was pleased to hear from Stewart's presentation that he believes that the new agreement signed on PNR with the Europeans will assist in that process.

We would also like to urge DHS to explore possibilities for combining screening and exit processing and leveraging the existing programs that are in place to better meet the needs of the traveling public, while enhancing vital security needs.

ATA is very, very strong in its desires to see a very seamless, fully integrated approach to passenger processing and screening. We know that DHS is looking to TSA and CVP to partner, and we're anxious to see that work as soon as possible.

It goes without saying that, since September 11th, there can be little question that air travel has become much less inviting. All the programs that are in place when foreigners come here, the Visa Waiver Program, the Travel Without Visa Program which has been suspended, US-VISIT, CAPS 2, it's daunting.

We hope that all of these unique, individual programs can be combined in order to facilitate easy travel with foreign passengers.

Just in closing, I'd reiterate over and over again our interest in working with DHS and all the government agencies to ensure that trade and travel is as easy as possible, and do appreciate Jim's efforts in continually working with us and reaching out to us.

It has been truly a partnership that I think has been almost unique in its foundations, because we're on the phone every single day, and I think that's been very helpful. So, thank you very much. I look forward to taking your questions.

1.3

2.4

US-VISIT PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

By Elyse Wander, Senior Vice President

Government Affairs and Member Programs

Travel Industry Association

MS. WANDER: Good morning. I'm Elyse Wander. I'm with the Travel Industry Association of America.

I know not everyone in the audience knows what TIA, as we call ourselves, is. It's the national not-for-profit trade association that represents all segments of the travel and tourism industry.

Our mission is a very simple and direct one.

That is to facilitate and promote travel to and within the United States. Obviously, here today we're talking about travel to the United States.

For starters, let me just say that, as a policy matter, TIA supports the development and the expansion of new and existing programs that increase security at United States' points of entry, while at the same time facilitating inbound, legitimate travelers.

Barbara and Jim have characterized their relationship with each other and with us in the same way, I would say, in a very active, very robust, proactive relationships. We speak frequently.

I really have to pay a compliment at this

point, particularly to the folks at DHS. I think they operate in a very businesslike manner, and they're very responsive, we have found, to the business community, not just travel and tourism, but to a lot of your industries.

2.4

They tell us what they're going to do. They tell us what the deadline is, and they do it. They make it. We aren't always thrilled with the outcome, but they've made it very easy over the few months, frankly, that they've been in business to anticipate and expect what's coming our way.

Overall, TIA is, in fact, supportive of the US-VISIT program. I would confess to you that early on we were frustrated by what we perceived as surprise announcements that impacted our industry, but over time we have found that the Department of Homeland Security solicits our viewpoints, our input, before and after they implement some of their policies, and they've been willing to make some adjustments along the way.

But as we've heard a number of times already this morning, the successful introduction of change really requires a strong emphasis on communications and outreach. This is an area where we at TIA feel that we have a role to play where we can be active and we can be helpful. We put out a lot of regular communications

to our membership.

1.3

2.4

I invite you, any of you, to take a look at our Web site, www.tia.org, particularly in the Government Affairs section. We are always updating the policy pronouncements as we understand them and as they become available to us from all elements of the United States Government, whether it's the Commerce Department, State Department, or DHS.

We did something very interesting at our annual trade show. It's the largest trade show that takes place in the United States dealing with international inbound travel. We had it this year at the end of April.

We gave the Department of Homeland Security a free booth, which we never do, on the trade show floor so that they could meet with people who are suppliers of the U.S. travel product and sellers overseas of the U.S. travel product.

They were able to demonstrate the US-VISIT program, answer questions, try to dispel some of the myths, and reassure folks that we rely on to sell travel to the U.S.

We also gave them a free table at our Media Marketplace, where they could meet and speak with international journalists, all of whom are pre-

qualified as folks who write a lot about travel to the U.S. They, in fact, have to submit evidence that when they come to our show they've written, or they don't get invited back again. So, we're trying to do our part to help clarify and get the information out there.

1.3

2.4

You will hear this afternoon, I know, from a person or two from the Department of State, if I could suggest something you might press them on. It's the development of a Web site, or a space on their Web site that they have told us they are working on, and that's intended to be a comprehensive place where you can go and find the information that a few of you in the audience have said this morning would be very helpful to you.

How long do I need to expect it will take to get an appointment for an interview to get a visa? How long do I need to wait if there's any delay in obtaining that visa?

All those sorts of nitty-gritty issues that are frustrating to your customers and to your members, they say they are going to put up on the Web site, whether it crosses inter-departmental lines or not.

What you should urge them to do, if you're so inclined, is to speed it up, because from our perspective they're not doing it as quickly as we think

it can feasibly be done. So, write them, talk to them, do whatever you need to do.

1.3

2.4

We do have concerns. I passed out some compliments. We have some concerns. Let me just say, most of them center around delays at the U.S. ports of entry.

Delays, in our estimation, are more than an inconvenience. Delays can be the kind of frustrating experience that caused people not to return to the United States and not to suggest to their friends and family that they come here.

We share Barbara's concern and the ATA's concern about whether there would be enough staff to get people into the country this year at our points of entry. Jim, I hope you might be able to comment, if we have time for Q&A, on where DHS stands on the hiring freeze that was imposed earlier this year.

What else do we worry about? Well, we're worried a little bit about the exit piece. Barbara spoke to it earlier. It's not yet been implemented. It's undergoing some testing. We hope that whatever that solution is is an easy one and a simple one for visitors to figure out.

We very much hope that the Department of
Homeland Security will not consider enforcing overstays

before that full entry/exit system is implemented. We hear that it's at least under consideration or discussion.

1.3

2.4

I don't know if that's just a whisper or not. We think it's premature because, frankly, it will distract from the work that inspectors already have to do when they don't fully have tools in place.

With respect to land borders, we all can imagine that they present a very, very different environment for implementation of US-VISIT than do our seaports and airports. So far, we like what we see. So far, so good.

We're pleased that DHS tell us they're working to minimize delays at borders, and we're also delighted to see that so far the proposed deployment incorporates, but does not duplicate, the existing inspection programs. So, we're very pleased, at least, at what we hear.

Let me just sum up by saying that TIA is going to continue to follow the development of US-VISIT, and urge the government to use every opportunity available to them to improve the inspection efficiencies. We hope that the process will be shorter. We know it's added, so far, about 15 seconds, but we still hear reports of two-plus hour delays.

1 2

I heard of some yesterday from one of our cruise line members who had done a pretty good look-see at it in their area and said it was attributable to two things: under-staffing and lack of inspectors who can speak languages other than English.

But I promise you, we're going to continue to do our best to continue our cooperation with Homeland Security and to try to facilitate more and more of that outreach and communication that will make it easier for our industry, and frankly everyone's industry, to get more visitors into our country.

Thanks a lot. We look forward to your questions.

MR. WILLIAMS: Right here in the second row.

MS. FISCHER-WYATT: My name is Helen Fischer-Wyatt. I'm an American living in Hamburg, Germany.

I've been there 30 years. I work at Incentive Travel and am a member of the VISIT USA Committee.

I understand the Herculean task that you're having implementing these new systems, and I think it's really wonderful. But I have to object to something you said. You talked about how travelers are happy about these new systems, and it makes them feel secure.

Well, recently in Hamburg, on the very first page of the local newspaper after this agreement about

the exchange of flight information, there was this huge outrage. This was a first-page article about all the information that was being given to the authorities in the United States.

1.3

2.4

I was reading here in your press release,

"VISIT US has published a privacy impact assessment
that ensures that personal information is used
appropriately, protected from misuse and improper
disclosure, and destroyed when no longer needed, and
updated as necessary."

I get questions daily. What happens to all of this data that you are getting, and how long is it stored? Germans do not like this. They have big issues with privacy anyway, and I'm sure it's the same for all international visitors coming into the United States, absolutely, and we're not happy.

MR. WILLIAMS: Let me address both your questions. When I said, generally travelers are happy, we do survey travelers who have been through the US-VISIT process, and it's based upon listening to them. It's not just because we say they're happy, it's what they're telling us.

With regard to the second question about privacy, under the Privacy Act you do what's called a System of Records Notice. Many of the systems we're

using today are legacy systems which have their own records retention. I believe for IDENT, which is our fingerprint system, the legacy INS had a 75-year records retention.

1.3

2.4

Now, it doesn't matter how long we're going to keep it, whether it's 75 seconds or 75 years, it's important, what do we do with that, how do we protect it, how do we make sure it's only shared with people who have a legitimate need to have access to that information?

That's what we do through that System of Records Notice and through the building of our information systems, and the policies around them, is to make sure we adequately protect that information.

We are very, very sensitive to the perceptions about privacy. Recently I took a bunch of kids to the National Spy Museum, and there was a survey: how many Americans think the U.S. Government keeps a secret database on them? The answer was, 67 percent of Americans think we keep a secret database on them.

So, we are very sensitive to people's concerns, especially European concerns and Far East concerns about privacy. We are doing our best to put in place a system which we think we put in place, and we'll continue to refine it to make sure it meets those

privacy needs.

2.4

It's not only about making people feel safe coming here, but people feeling that their data will be adequately protected. That's very important to us. That's why we have a privacy officer who works directly in my organization.

That's why we work very closely with Nula O'Connor-Kelly. If you don't know Nula, she is a delightful person, but also a very, very strong-willed individual.

I will also tell you, with any concerns that the private sector people have later today, you have Al Martinez-Fonts. He is the private sector liaison who works directly for the Secretary.

Al is a great guy. I like him enormously.

But he is the person who, if the private sector doesn't

feel like I'm listening, doesn't feel like Stewart

Verdery's listening, he is the advocate within the

Department.

He's the only person I know of like that in the Federal Government, that level who responds directly to the private sector. Beyond that, we also have just one more point. We have a US-VISIT advisory board comprised of federal executives, chaired by Asa Hutchinson.

1 2

)

Doug Baker of Department of Commerce sits on that board representing Travel and Tourism, and Janice Jacobs, representing Visa Services from State represents the visa interests, trying to make sure we always factor in to our long-term plans, as well as work in the private sector, the perspective from people who represent all those interests.

Nula O'Connor-Kelly, the Federal Government's first-ever Chief Privacy Officer, is on that US-VISIT advisory board. So, we do pay very particular attention to this issue.

Way in the back, please.

VOICE: (off microphone)

MR. WILLIAMS: You said you came with an outof-state license and had to show many different other forms of identification.

VOICE: Exactly. Now, my concern is, after showing the five different forms, my passport, military card, driver's license, Social Security card, and it got almost to the point of original birth certificate issued not by the hospital, but it had to be a state issuance, I'd like to know how that information that goes to -- that I submitted, and actually it wasn't all of that information, but that was what was asked for, what does the private sector do to protect that

information? Do we have anything in force at this time to protect an individual? I'm just looking for added clarification to the woman that worked in Germany, or Belgium.

MR. WILLIAMS: Sir, you were talking about when you went in to buy a car?

VOICE: No question about it. I understand that this is about travel. However, we were talking about identification.

MR. WILLIAMS: If you're asking us how we protect it versus how a car dealership that has access to commercial databases, I can't speak for the car dealerships. But as I just responded to the previous question --

VOICE: He's asking a question about privacy. How does the private sector protect the same kinds of information that the government is trying to protect.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, there are privacy laws in this country that they're expected to abide by. I will tell you, the information that we're collecting for US-VISIT doesn't take any information from the commercial sector. We take personal information that travelers provide to us and protect that information, in accordance with the Privacy Act and other acts.

There was a gentleman who was over here who

1.3

2.4

was actually first, if we could. Go ahead.

1.3

2.4

VOICE: Let me try it again. We're here from Europe and we want to address the concerns we have in Germany, the U.K. and Italy or the concerns that we don't -- or the public doesn't know what the American side does with the data, with information you collect.

We understand it's needed. We support you wherever we can. We think you do your best to implement all these systems. Let's recommend, again, to you that you come to Europe and do an aggressive and very positive campaign explaining this to the potential traveler.

We will help you, from all -- committees, all two operators from all sides. We will help you to get this message, positive, across, 100 percent, because we support you in that. The only thing is, we need a campaign to explain what's happening.

Finally, today we got the message from you, and I'm thankful for that, that October 1 will be the date that even piece of paper will be -- fingerprints will be taken, and pictures. So, we have to get this message across. It's only one page and it's only one introduction. Let's really sell it positive to the travelers.

MR. WILLIAMS: We'd be happy to do so.

Actually, my boss, Asa Hutchinson, just recently came back from a European trip where he was doing just that, talking about the September 30th date, talking about US-VISIT. I believe I'm supposed to be over there in the Hague on July 1, and we'll be glad to take you up on that.

2.4

We try to communicate as best we can. We appreciate the offer to communicate better. We understand the issues that Europeans have with privacy and with biometrics.

But I will tell you, even Secretary Ridge, in his testimony yesterday in front of the Senate Judiciary, talked about a meeting he had recently had with the 25 EU countries, and all of them were looking to move in the same direction we are, using biometrics around border security. The EU is looking at their visitor information system, using the same two biometrics we use today.

What we're trying to do, is to move together in the international arena so we can promote the movement of legitimate people and stop the bad people where we encounter them.

But you're right. We do have to communicate better, and especially around what we do with the information, and we'll take you up on that. Thanks.

VOICE: (off microphone)

1.3

2.4

MR. WILLIAMS: We understand. Don't worry.

Anna and Barbara over here are taking notes. They're very good at setting these things up. And anything else you want to talk to us about on how to communicate, what vehicles, what forums, please, talk to Anna Hinken. She works with us.

Barbara Shipley is right here from Fleischman-Hillard, our public relations firm, an international firm that also works for the State Department on visa services to make sure we can do the best we can to get the message out correctly around the world.

VOICE: On the note of communications, we have a vehicle called AA to help you with that. They have so many contacts. They have a Web site, travelers.org. What more can TIA do to help facilitate the communication? Because that seems to be the biggest barrier and frustration right now.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, let me publicly than

Elyse for allowing us a booth at their pow-wow in Los

Angeles. I understand we had long lines of people who

wanted to get questions answered about US-VISIT. We

very much appreciate that.

And whether it's a linkage on a Web site, whether it's forums where you want us to address

things, we'll always listen to our private sector partners on how you want us to communicate and how we can do a better job. I think, as Helen introduced them, they're not shy.

1.3

2.4

VOICE: I'm sure there are additional ways beyond those that I described that we can be helpful, and I look forward to chatting—if you're going to be at lunch—with you about those. I would say that one that comes to mind immediately is that, as I say, we've got a lot of the information already. It's not all being pushed out. It's not all being heard.

We can certainly feed that more effectively, it seems to me, to the VISIT USA committees because of a point that we heard that just was clarified this morning, about the October 1 deadline, has been known to us for months. So, I think we may need to tighten up those lines of communication so that you have it and can push it out much more immediately.

MS. ABRAMS: I'm Stephanie Abrams, Travel With Stephanie Abrams, of the Business Talk Radio Network, although I don't sound like it today.

I think part of the underlying difficulty of the intersection of the two hands that are trying to clap and are missing each other, is that the airport experience and the airline experience used to be part of the hospitality industry and the hospitality experience, and was really left in the hands of each of the suppliers to perform the welcoming services and the warm fuzzy feeling that brought people into the U.S.

1.3

2.4

We relied on the carriers to create that welcoming experience, and since going through Customs and Immigration was a very routine process, we didn't look for very much of that to be hospitable, just efficient.

With the very necessary imposition of all of the technical things revolving around our national security that are now imposed in the airport process and the transportation process, it has now created something that's less than hospitable.

I think, underlying all the very technical, real, and important issues related to security that must happen, the underlying thread that is repeated again and again related to visas, related to travel, related to the travelers' experience, whether it's hospitable, whether they want to come back a second time or never come here again and tell all their friends that, which has impact on everybody sitting in this room and in so many places where we are related by various threads, it's really important that a serious look be taken at how to make human, personable, warm,

and hospitable all the simple things that, in the realm of national security, seem inconsequential, but in the realm of travel, tourism and hospitality, are essential, right down to, if you're going to ask people to take off their shoes, then put a rug on the floor, or give them little paper slippers like you would if they were entering a hospital room. But nobody's looking at that, because you're looking at the most important safety and security issues.

So it would be almost like a manufacturer manufacturing the most superb motor and making you sit on it with a saddle and four wheels and calling it a great car.

Somewhere in there, creature comfort, warmth, hospitality, right down to the simple thing of instructing every person who works at a port of entry, the first person you see when you get off an international flight when you are completely exhausted, should have a great, big, plastered smile like the old-time airline stewardess who welcomes you to the U.S.

2.4

1.3

MS. ABRAMS: And you know the scary part? It doesn't cost a penny. It doesn't cost a nickel for somebody to be instructed that, when people arrive, you don't just say, U.S. citizens to the right, foreigners

to the left.

1.3

2.4

MS. ABRAMS: It's so obvious and it's so clear to people in travel hospitality. Yet, everybody sitting on your side of the desk is so focused on the real human issue of saving lives and protecting lives, that you're missing the issue of, we will put up such a barrier we don't have to worry about who we're saving, because the only ones trying to get in are the people who want to be mean.

So, I'm hoping that somewhere in what you're doing there is some real and ongoing dialogue and communication to let you know those little tiny things that cost nothing, but will make all the difference between people feeling warmly embraced, because almost everybody trying to get in just wants to come in with their plastic and their money, and we'd love to see them.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thanks for your comment. Let me address it. You're exactly right. The experience of a traveler or the experience of anybody going into a grocery store comes down to that human interaction that you have in a one-to-one setting.

Jay O'Hearn is the Assistant Commissioner for Field Operations within Customs and Border Protection,

responsible for the 25,000 officers at ports of entry. He is acutely aware that there are, and have been, some complaints about rudeness by his officers, and he is taking steps to make sure that they have the right kind of customer service training so that they understand that, as they're doing that very, very difficult job -- and if you think about those officers, whether they're doing a one-minute inspection in the airport or a 7- to 10-second inspection at a land border, sitting right there in that small moment of time, they have to make that national security decision.

1.3

2.4

They have to also make sure they protect our economic security by welcoming people. They are representative of our international relations with our partners, because word travels quickly by word of mouth if somebody was treated rudely.

They have to balance those goals right there in that human interaction. Jay O'Hearn is well aware of that. I would say, if you have concerns about rude inspectors, he is trying to do something about it, as well as TSA is addressing this with their screener workforce.

But you can contact Jay directly. You can do it through our office or you can do it directly to Jay

O'Hearn's office. If you send Anna Hinken an e-mail, she'll make sure it gets to the right place. But we are sensitive to that issue. Actually, I completely agree with you. It costs nothing. Thank you. MR. BAKER: Thank you. Let me interrupt the discussion here. We really do have to eat today.

after 11:30. We'll break for lunch. The next panel

reconvenes here at 1:15.

> (Whereupon, at 11:30 a.m. the meeting was recessed and resumed back on the record at 1:20 p.m.)

1

AFTERNOON SESSION

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 2.4

25

MR. LONG: Well, good afternoon. Thank you for all coming back. It is a pleasure to see you and have such a good turnout for this important conference.

My name is David Long. I'm the Director of Service Industries in Doug Baker's shop. What I'd like to do now is take care of a couple of administrative things, and then introduce the first panel of the afternoon.

Carrie Justice, to my right here, has a Someone left their package with a lot of private notes. If someone's lost it, please touch base with Carrie, who'll return it to you.

We will also try to, in non-Washingtonian style, use as few as abbreviations in the afternoon as we can to try to accommodate a non-Washingtonian quests here.

But let me begin. It's a real pleasure to introduce such a terrific and accomplished panel as the one you'll see talking in a few minutes about milestones of visa implementation.

Our first speaker is Catherine Barry, who's the Managing Director in the Office of Visa Services in the Bureau of Consular Affairs at the State Department. She's graciously stepped in place of Janice Jacobs,

who was kept away by a family emergency.

1.3

2.4

Ms. Barry has extensive experience in visa issues, knows Latin America well, and has also served in Asia and the Middle East for the State Department. She brings a very broad perspective to the entire temporary entry set of issues.

Our next speaker following her is Theresa

Brown, who is Director of Immigration Policy for the

U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Theresa is likewise a widely known, highly respect immigration professional, working with the Chamber.

She also has more than 10 years' experience in immigration law with private firms and has been, the past three years, an Associate Director for Business Immigration Advocacy at the American Immigration Lawyers Association. She joined the U.S. Chamber in 2001. Her specialties naturally include temporary entry issues. It is a pleasure to welcome her to the panel as well.

The third member of our group today who will be joining us shortly, who was delayed, is the president of George Washington University, Mr. Stephen Trachtenberg. Mr. Trachtenberg is the fifteenth president of the university and began there in 1988. That followed more than 11 years as president at the

University of Hartford.

1.3

2.4

An incredibly accomplished man, widely published author, his biography in your packet lists at least three major books, Thinking Out Loud, Speaking His Mind, and Reflections on Higher Education.

He is also acting right now as the chair of the D.C. Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors, the Atlantic 10 Conference President's Council. He's a member of virtually unlimited amounts of boards, foundations, and other civic organizations in the city.

Just to give you some idea of the depth of his experience, last year he was actually the recipient of a humanitarian award of the Albert B. Sabin Institute.

This came after he had been honored the previous year as an honorary doctor of law at the University of New Haven, and had previously received the U.S. Treasury Department's Medal of Merit.

It's difficult to know where to start to bring highlights from a resume that complex and that impressive. One I left out was something he included at the very end, where he noted that he was a graduate of James Madison High School in Brooklyn, New York.

It turns out that my wife is a graduate of that same high school, and that everywhere we have gone in the United States and the world we have encountered

other graduates of James Madison High School, and every single one has been interesting, informative, and a pleasure to talk to, and I'm sure Mr. Trachtenberg is stunned to hear about his high school experience right now.

1.3

2.4

MR. LONG: Our fourth speaker today is Marlene Johnson. Marlene is the executive director and CEO of NAFSA: Association of International Educators. Under her leadership, the education community has captured the attention of leaders at all levels of society, resulting in presidential memorandum, congressional resolutions in favor of the kinds of exchanges in international education policy that she represents.

She has more than three decades of experience in the business community, government, and nonprofit management. A dynamic and successful leader, she's held board positions at the World Press Institute, the National Association of Women Business Owners, the National Council of Women Executives in State Governments, and the AFS Intercultural Exchange Program, all in all, another very impressive member of our panel.

Finally, without taking up too much more of your time here, I'd like to introduce Leonard Karp.

Len is the executive vice president and chief operating officer of Philadelphia International Medicine. This is basically a marketing and management company owned by some of the most prestigious hospitals in the U.S., including Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, Crozier-Keystone Health System, Fox-Chase Cancer Center, McGee Hospital, Moss Rehab, Pennsylvania Hospital, Temple University Hospital, and others, including the Pennsylvania Medical Center.

Although this program is still relatively new, only five years old, so far it's added more than \$50 million to the regional economy. This organization is active across the Middle East, Brazil, Chile, Uruguay, the Caribbean, Canada, Korea, and Italy.

In addition, Len serves on one of the industry advisory committees, advising us on trade negotiations, and is an active participant working with the government to foster international trade and press the services agenda forward.

Finally, I'd like to thank him personally for his many contributions to this conference. He played a lead role in conceiving and shaping it, and his strong support truly makes him one of the spirits behind the events today.

So, without further ado, let me turn the event

1.3

2.4

over to Ms. Barry and we'll begin.

1

MILESTONES OF VISA IMPLEMENTATION

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.4

25

By Catherine Barry

Managing Director, Office of Visa Services

U.S. Department of State

David, thank you very much. MS. BARRY:

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm very happy to be here today and to have this opportunity to speak with you about the efforts of the State Department, and particularly the Bureau of Consular Affairs, to achieve a balance between the needs of national security and legitimate travel and immigration.

We frequently quote our boss, Secretary Powell, who often refers to our goal as "a balance between secure borders and open doors." Consular officers serve in the first line of defense as they interview visa applicants from around the world.

They do their job with security, first and foremost, but they are also mindful of the great strengths of this country which must be nurtured and preserved. We are an open society and we all value the diversity and richness of the experience that derives from an international exchange.

Consular officers realize that there are several strategic interests served by an effective visa policy. To highlight a few of those other interests, I

would say: facilitation of commerce, academic and scientific exchanges, tourism, family reunification, and refugee resettlement.

1.3

2.4

I want to assure you as well that consular officers understand that the very definition of national security must include consideration of our economy and the impact that actions in visa process may have on our economic well-being.

For example, we are well aware of the fact that the U.S. travel and tourism industry is one of the most vital segments of the U.S. economy and one of our largest earners of foreign exchange.

Last year, approximately 42 million foreign visitors, whether here for pleasure, work or study, spent over \$83 billion on travel to the U.S., compared to \$78 billion spent by Americans abroad.

The travel and tourism industry, of course, is also one of America's biggest employers. One of every eight people in the U.S. civilian labor force is employed in some segment of the travel and tourism industry.

Consular officers are also proud of America's educational institutions and frequently conduct outreach to encourage foreign students to come to the United States.

They are well aware that international education and cultural exchange is one of our most potent means of influencing world opinion and developing lasting and meaningful relationships, and is an important part of our service sector export.

Consular officers' appreciation of all of these various strategic national interests are reinforced, I can assure you, by Secretary Powell, by U.S. ambassadors serving overseas, other senior managers of the Department of State, and they're frequently discussed in our in-house meetings and in our outreach activities.

A frequent theme of our internal dialogue is the unprecedented changes that we have in visa processing and the nature of how we can provide great security under the scrutiny that we have of the Congress and the American public. We have a statutory mandate.

It is an exciting, but very challenging, time for us to try and meet new mandates, as well as continue our traditional goals of good service to the American public and to foreign nationals who wish to come here.

Let me highlight a few of the steps we've taken to strengthen the integrity of the visa process.

2.5

We have greatly increased the level of data shared between the Department of State and law enforcement and intelligence agencies.

We have made available visa information to immigration officers of the Department of Homeland Security at all U.S. ports of entry. We have tightened visa interview requirements.

We have enhanced training for consular officers, particularly training in interviewing techniques, as a way of helping them use the visa interview effectively to find evidence of deception.

We have joined other federal agencies in the creation of a terrorist screening center to provide a more systematic approach to posting lookouts on potential and known terrorists, our greatest threat at the moment.

We have established 60 standard operating procedures for consular officers abroad in order to get better uniformity and accountability in visa processing.

Despite these major milestones, there are obviously complaints coming from the traveling public.

The major complaint is that we took on too much and we didn't have a resource base to sustain our activity.

I'd like to first address probably the most

difficult challenge we have, which is biometric collection. The biometric that we are collecting is an electronic scan of the traveler's two index fingers. This is the machine that we use. It is in front of every consular officer, or will be in front of every consular officer overseas by October of this year.

1.3

2.4

The biometric collection, that's it. You just put your index finger there, and then you put your other index finger there, and that's the entire biometric collection. It takes a matter of seconds.

Even dealing with difficult languages and sometimes the need for a interpreter, biometric collection has not added more than 30 seconds to the activity in front of the consular officer.

It is done in front of the consular officer also as a way of not also providing accountability for the data collection, but as a way of having a seamless transition to the visa interview. So they are part and parcel, and we're trying to make this as efficient as possible in this, the first generation of biometric collection.

The feedback we're getting from the overseas traveling public has been quite positive so far. I think many potential travelers to the United States realize that this process is helping their security,

not just U.S. national security.

1.3

2.4

For example, one of the benefits for them is that by freezing their entity in this way, we are preventing them from suffering from undue effects of identity theft.

We have the biometric collection in place now in 143 offices overseas. We have 211 visa processing posts altogether. We will be in compliance with the legislative mandate to be doing this in every single office overseas by October of this year.

We have added more officers to our overseas complement. We added 80 additional officer positions in this fiscal year, and we are on track to add another 45 officers in the next fiscal year.

We are tracking carefully the number of posts overseas where the wait for a visa appointment is more than 30 days. Looking at our list two days ago, I found 17 posts out of the 211 that were not able to provide a visa interview within 30 days.

Close to 97 percent of the visa applicants who come forward receive a decision as to their visa eligibility, and most receive their actual visas within 48 hours of the interview.

We are working on public outreach. We have completely redesigned the Web site here in Washington

that we are responsible for, the Web site of the Bureau of Consular Affairs. You should be seeing the results of our work very shortly.

1.3

2.4

We are encouraging our consular officers overseas who are responsible for the Web pages of individual U.S. embassies to make sure their information is up to date. We have more call centers now in operation. We now have a call center, for example, in operation in China.

We are making it easier for people who might be in the United States but want to go back overseas, possibly for a summer vacation or a family visit, and who believe they need a new visa in order to reenter the United States, to make that appointment from here.

Those countries where the local infrastructure has readily available access to the worldwide Web, we do have more and more posts using the Internet to give out appointments, which of course is very efficient, both for the embassy and for the traveling public.

I mentioned that most applicants get an answer on the spot. Approximately a little over 2 percent of the visa applications we receive must be submitted to Washington for screening by several U.S. federal agencies. We are trying to make sure that this process is done as efficiently as possible.

In the Bureau of Consular Affairs, we invested a million dollars in enhanced software to support this one particular function, and we have also added more people to the visa office to track these cases, to work with our federal partners, and to get answers back overseas as quickly as possible. We know that other agencies who are involved in this activity have improved their resources as well.

1.3

2.4

Today, some 80 percent of the people who do need a special screening from Washington-based agencies are getting an answer within three weeks. We are not yet where we want to be, but we are committed to continuing to improve our business process to facilitate the travel of those who need this special review. We do realize that most of them are legitimate travelers and we want to get them on their way as soon as possible.

Our work is not yet done. The Homeland Security Council is leading an interagency policy coordination committee to look at visa policy and procedures, port of entry issues, and to identify more goals for us.

There is also a major effort to improve our outreach so that we can overcome misperceptions about travel to the United States, and the new measures of

our border security program.

1.3

2.4

I understand in this morning's session there was quite a bit of talk about the visa waiver program, particularly how that is affecting travelers coming from Europe.

Let me say that I think the best way to intellectually approach this is to distinguish between the traveler and the government. The best thing for the traveler to do, is to make sure that they have a machine-readable passport.

A machine-readable passport is in production by all of the governments of the visa waiver countries. That is what the traveler should do, to make sure that they don't have an old-style passport, but that they have a machine-readable passport.

The government has another responsibility, and that is to develop a biometric passport. I think you discussed this morning the fact that there's a deadline of October 26 of this year for the governments to be making biometric passports, and that they will not meet that deadline.

The U.S. Government will also not be able to produce a biometric passport in that time frame. We have used our own experience in trying to develop the next generation passport to help convince Congress that

more time is needed.

1.3

2.4

Even with the best of political will and large amounts of money, you just can't pull together a production of a new generation passport in time. The standards for the new biometric passport were set by the International Civil Aviation Organization.

It took that organization time to go through technology, study pilot programs that have been in place, and come up with the standards for all governments to meet.

We are doing our very best to get Congress to extend the deadline. Secretary Powell testified himself and put the full course of his prestige behind the request for an extension. Although I'm fairly confident that we will get some relief on this point, we obviously can't assure you today as to when that might be.

There has also been some discussion of the fact that our various security programs have led to a drop in travel to the United States after September 11th. This is a very complex issue, and I really don't think that any one factor is behind that.

When you look at visa waiver travel, which has not yet been affected by new security measures, visa waiver travel is down about 20 percent.

So, that leads us to conclude, when we look at the travel of people who do have visas, special groups like students, we come to the conclusion that there are a number of factors at play in determining, now, why people are coming to the United States.

The truth is, many of the visa security procedures in place did exist before 9/11, in the sense that we always required significant information from visa applicants and we scrutinized every application very carefully.

The standards for adjudicating visas have not changed. Most visa denials are based not on security concerns, but rather on the statutory requirement that each applicant for a non-immigrant visa must be presumed to be ineligible until he or she establishes, to the satisfaction of the consular officer, his or her entitlement to legal non-immigrant status. Fraudulent documentation and misrepresentation are still found by consular officers in many visa cases around the world.

I'd like to end with a key message. As you engage in your activities, especially with foreign partners in the travel and tourism industry, my main message would be to encourage events planning.

People wishing to come to the United States who need a visa should apply for that visa early.

Those who already have a visa should keep it valid and make a timely application for a new visa when they see that their visa is about to expire.

There is no denying that our offices overseas are very busy. Last year, we did over seven million cases, and we're expecting to have six million cases this year around the world.

We do want to keep our lines of communication open with members of the travel industry and the academic community, and other special interest groups. We want to work on real solutions to any perceived obstacles in travel to the United States because we do want to make our country safer, and also have an open door. Thank you very much.

MILESTONES OF VISA IMPLEMENTATION

By Theresa Brown

Director, Immigration policy

U.S. Chamber of Commerce

MS. BROWN: Hello, everyone. I want to thank Doug Baker and the folks here at the Department of Commerce for inviting me here.

Since I am at the Department of Commerce and since there's a lot of people not from Washington, let me just specify: I am from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, not the Department of Commerce.

We are a private sector organization. We represent approximately three million U.S. businesses in every sector of the economy, of every size, and every shape, in every corner of the economy, as we constantly tell tourists to DC who stop by our building instead of coming here, and vice versa. So, I thought I'd just clarify that up front.

You saw me furiously scribbling. I have a tendency always to want to respond to everything I've heard, and I've been here since this morning. But I've been told to talk slower and keep my remarks brief, so I'll try to stay on point and on message.

One of my duties at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, I am Director for Immigration Policy, so I

deal with an awful lot of issues relating to immigration.

1.3

2.4

A lot of the letter categories that you heard Steve Pinkos talk about this morning are things that I work on on a regular basis, and I do understand them, but I won't try to explain them to you.

This issue of the visa process, facilitation, management of our borders and ports of entry, has been my number-one priority and taking up the majority of my time since 9/11 because it does impact such a broad spectrum of our membership from everyone in the travel and tourism industry.

As everyone knows, that's one in eight jobs in this country, is in the travel and tourism industry directly or indirectly, to businesses engaged in international trade and commerce, to members that are trying to get work visas for parts of their workforce, to folks of ours who are involved in higher education, medical facilities, you name it.

So, we have this broad spectrum of interest and representation, and we have heard very loudly from every single corner of that membership about these issues.

I think it's worthwhile to sort of just very quickly go through all the changes that have taken

place since 9/11 in our visa process and in our security process. There's been a lot of different layers that have happened, and some have happened in concert and some have happened sort of almost seemingly ad hoc. There's been a lot of changes.

1.3

2.4

Some of the most reported is an increase in the number and extent of background and security checks at a lot of different phases of the visa process. This is not just the sending of certain visa applications back to Washington for other agencies to check.

This is additional screening that happens at the consular offices when they check their own databases, additional information going into those databases, sharing of those databases with other agencies as the person arrives here, looking more closely at technology-related interactions between foreign nationals and the United States and what impact that may have on national security.

We have had a requirement, again, for inperson interviews, which has been talked about.

Interior registration of foreign nationals in the
United States called the NCIRS process that was
introduced in 2001 and 2002. The development of the
US-VISIT system, entry/exit, the new biometric
requirements.

All of these things have come at sort of a very rapid pace in terms of changes to the visa process that all of us have understood to be the case for many, many, many years. I know that that has fed a lot of the frustration and increase in the international public because they don't understand.

It just seems like, here comes the next thing. We're bowled over constantly by the next wave of things coming at us, and we can't put it all together in one cohesive package.

I don't think I'm here to tell you that it's any better because you know better than I, but I think what I can say, is I think we're on back side, on the second phase of reaction to 9/11.

We put all these things in place very quickly after 9/11. Some of them were administrative actions, some of them were congressionally mandated actions.

But the idea after 9/11 was simply, close all the loopholes. What happened to allow people in 9/11? How do we prevent that from happening? Can we just close all the loopholes? So, there as a very quick reaction to anything that possibly could have been a problem, we're going to shut down.

Now we're looking in the second phase, I think both DHS, the State Department, and others, on how do

we refine these things that we have put in place? How do we make them integrate? How do we create, as somebody said earlier, that seamless process for visitors to get through to come to the United States?

I think that is where the government and the private sector can work together, and should work together, most closely to refine that process so that for the international traveler, international visitor, they know what they're getting into when they come and it's a welcoming process.

We all know the impacts of the changes. We all know what's happened. Obviously, delays. That's the one everybody points to, a delay in getting an interview, a delay in getting a visa, a delay in getting a check, a delay in getting to their airport, all these delays. I think that everyone is aware that those delays have cost associated with them.

I'm very glad to hear from Catherine that the State Department realizes that a 30-day interview is not yet where they want to be, because certainly for business 30 days is a long time to wait for certain people to get a visa. If you're trying to close a deal, a multi-million dollar deal, you don't necessarily have 30 days to wait.

I think one of the things also is this

1.3

2.4

perception -- and I don't know if it's real or not. I think the data is inconclusive about, are there more denials of visas.

1.3

2.4

I think probably people are more aware of denials and there may be a perception that the denials are because of the security issues. Catherine is absolutely right. Under our immigration law, like it or not, U.S. immigration law presumes everyone guilty until they can prove themselves innocent.

What do I mean by that? Everyone is presumed to want to come here and stay and live, in violation of whatever temporary visa status they have, unless they can prove conclusively they're not. The burden of proof is on the individual. This is not well understood around the world.

Not only is it not well understood--I see people shaking their heads--it seems counterintuitive. Why do they presume that? I can't tell you why that is. That provision has been in our law, literally, since 1952. Okay. So it's nothing new. It's always been around.

But people don't understand that, so when they're denied and they're saying you don't have enough ties to home, they didn't know that's what they needed to present, necessarily, or how much they needed to

present.

1.3

2.4

Some of that is some of the things that we can do to better prepare people before they go to the consular office to let them know, this is the burden of proof you have to make. Bring everything you possibly can to make that burden of proof happen, up front, because you don't want to have to come back a second time.

The delays obviously have costs, as I said.

There are costs to the agencies. There are costs to the travelers. We don't often think about it, but the agencies have a lot of additional costs because of the changes.

The backlogs in case processing, for example, at Citizenship and Immigration Services, which is the U.S. side that pre-processes visas for workers, for example, and does some of the student visa processing, they've grown exponentially because of these additional security checks.

There is, frankly, a lack of resources. These security checks were put in place very quickly at the agencies without any additional funding, so they had to pull resources from wherever they could to do these additional things.

Frankly, the amount of additional funding and

resources given to them in the out years since 9/11 has not increased that dramatically to deal with all these changes. For example, the in-person interviews that State Department instituted last year initially were done without additional personnel at any of the consular posts.

1.3

2.4

There's a number of additional hires that are coming in this year--I think it's less than 100 around the world--that are hopefully going to be focused at posts that are the most backlogged. But as you can tell, that doesn't seem like a lot of help when you have six million visa applications around the world to deal with.

The cost to the travelers. We know about increased fees. We know about additional travel time. We know about the delays. From the business community I want to talk a little bit about ours.

As I said, the Chamber is hearing about this issue from a lot of different angles, but I want to talk about one specific slice that probably other panelists will not.

That is, business visitor visas, the B-1 visa, which is the most common business visa, next to tourists, which are B-2. B-1 is the next most common visa, and often they're linked and done at the same

time. You get a combination business/tourist visa.

1.3

2.4

That is the lifeblood of international trade and commerce, is to be able to have in-person meetings between U.S. companies and foreign companies who are conducting business deals, who are holding meetings, who are going to conference and trade shows to sell products, to develop the next generation of whatever. The inability of those customers—and we heard about it some this morning—to get visas to come into the United States is hurting our bottom line.

There was a recent study that came out just last week from eight different business organizations that just surveyed their own membership and said, can you put a dollar sign to the cost to you of these kinds of problems, not being able to get people visas to come in and conduct these deals?

And the extrapolation from that was that they estimated that the inability to get people visas in a timely fashion may be costing our United States economy \$30 billion in the last two years, and that's not insignificant.

We all know about travel and tourism. It's down about 30 percent in the last two years. That's another \$100 billion, if you want to do the math, that we may have lost in international travel and tourism.

So, we're not talking small change for our economy.

1.3

2.4

The biggest message I want to tell people is, and this is for government and private sector, we all know this: perception is reality. One of the hardest cases we have had to make to members of Congress and others, is they all want to tell us, prove that there's really a problem.

Show us the impact. What is hard for them to understand, is so long as there is a mass perception in the international community that it is difficult to come here, whether or not it actually is difficult to come here doesn't matter, because if they believe it is, they won't come.

That's the most important message and that's why communication is the key. We talked about it this morning: communication, outreach from the government to the private sector, us telling them what our issues are and concerns are, cooperating and outreach to the traveling public to get the right information out in a timely manner, and by that I mean well in advance of the change whenever possible.

To tell us about change a month before it happens, for a lot of people, is too late. They've already made plans, and now there's costs associated with changing them. So, we need to get out in front of

this curve. I'll wrap it up, because I'm getting the red flag. I'll take questions afterwards.

3

2

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

MILESTONES OF VISA IMPLEMENTATION

By Stephen J. Trachtenberg President and Professor of Public Administration The George Washington University

DR. TRACHTENBERG: Thank you. I am the president of George Washington University, as you've heard, and a graduate of James Madison High School.

DR. TRACHTENBERG: I am also chairman of the District of Columbia Chamber of Commerce, a conventionally confused situation.

But it useful perhaps to say to international guests that George Washington University, with an operating budget approaching \$1 billion a year, is an independent institution, which is to say, not state supported by either the District of Columbia or the U.S. Government. So, we are obliged to have, if not a business point of view, a business-like way of proceeding.

My perspective as the president of an institution that enrolls a large number of international students and was also a native New Yorker who watched the Twin Towers go up and then come down, and as a Washingtonian who saw black smoke coming out of the Pentagon on September 11, I have a particular

take on today's agenda.

The invitation to this forum states that the U.S. Government strives to strike a balance between its border security and its economic security, and I couldn't be more enthusiastic and endorse that more than I can.

But to define where that balance falls, we have to agree on what the benefit of international students, scholars, and researchers, and teachers are to America and to the world as opposed to the risk of having them here.

When I graduated from college in 1959, a total of 48,486 international students were enrolled in U.S. colleges and universities; 516 attended Columbia University where I graduated, and nearly one-third of them were Canadian, which hardly counts.

2.4

1.3

DR. TRACHTENBERG: At George Washington University where I am president today, 331 international students attended in 1959.

Now, if you look at America's campuses of today, 586,000 international students are enrolled, a twelve-fold increase. This year, George Washington University educated nearly 1,900 international students, about 1,400 at the graduated level.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

So, I want to argue that America is stronger economically, richer culturally, more secure militarily, and healthier socially because of the steady increase in the number of immigrants, international students, and educators and research personnel who have come here.

Let me give one example. International students alone spent \$12 billion per year in the United States on tuition, room and board, pizza and beer.

DR. TRACHTENBERG: From a purely selfish university president standpoint, that's terrific. that number short-changes the economic benefit of having somebody like Andrew Grove, born in Budapest, comes to America, studies at the City University of New York, goes on to establish Intel, a multi-billion dollar corporation that helped fuel the technology boom in America, and Andy Grove is not an exception. 1990, one-third of silicon valley IT professionals were foreign-born.

As we are seeking to balance national security and economic security, how much is it worth to America that the world's leading microchip manufacturer is located in California rather than Kyoto, with all due respect to the Japanese?

Number two. I would argue that the world is a more stable, more integrated, and more secure place because of the millions of students who had the opportunity to learn here and experience America.

America's greatest selling point is America.

1.3

2.2

2.4

A chance to study here is to know our principles, our values, our markets, our government, and our freedoms. So, that said, judging by our policies, one would think that we view foreign students as a burden, not a benefit.

I am much comforted by what Catherine had to say, but that is not the perception that my students have, nor is it the perception that American university presidents have, or most of the ambassadorial community that I work with here in the District of Columbia in Washington.

For American universities, this is a huge problem because we are in intense competition with other countries for top-quality international students, and frankly these other universities are eating our lunch, especially since 9/11.

Australia offers new students six months of English language learning free of cost before they enroll. England allows foreign students to hold jobs and actively helps them to find positions while they

are students. France has a major government-sponsored public relations campaign to attract international students.

1.3

2.4

America does virtually nothing to attract foreign students and we are proud of the fact that we are not getting in their way as much as we had been. We will not let them work here unless it is on campus, and the J-1 and the F-1 visa system is frankly seen as hostile to international students, especially since 9/11.

The number of visa problems for international students jumped from less than 1,000 in the year 2000 to nearly 15,000 in the year 2002. There is no time limit on resolving these visa issues, and they routinely take months to decide.

Students in many fields must reapply each year for a lengthy and expensive security clearance. Each security clearance must be signed off by several government agencies, some of which seem to be in no special hurry.

The new \$100 international student fee to cover these security checks is structured in such a way as to make payment difficult for students that come from developing nations that lack a sophisticated banking system.

1.3

2.4

New Social Security number requirements, necessary for students who find on-campus jobs, are cumbersome, time-consuming, staff-consuming, and appear to have no practical benefit for America.

As a result, at one institution, my institution, at George Washington University, the number of foreign students has declined from more than 2,300 in 1998 to less than 1,900 today.

Because of new F-1 and J-1 visa requirements, I need to employ 50 percent more staff in our International Students Office for 18 percent fewer international students, and my budget for program activities designed to ease the transition to American student life for international enrollees is down by 75 percent. So, we're employing far more to accomplish far less.

Nationally, the number of foreign applications to U.S. graduate schools, the cream of the crop, has declined by an astounding one-third in one year alone.

Now, these are, hopefully, the future inventors and entrepreneurs of tomorrow. They're going someplace, but they're not coming here. That probably means they're going elsewhere.

The number of potential international students taking the GREs, the standardized tests some of you

will remember from your student days used by most U.S. graduate programs to evaluate students, declined by 30 percent in 2004. So, I am concerned. I am gratified to hear that my government is concerned.

1.3

2.4

In the end, in the name of security, I believe we are in danger of hurting America economically and concurrently making the world less secure.

Now, I began by saying I was a native New Yorker, and my accent surely verifies that. I won't pretend for an instant that the terror threat isn't real, and I am certainly aware, as are all university presidents, that some of the 9/11 terrorists exploited vulnerabilities in our student visa system to come to America.

We are also aware that they all attended schools that very few of us would term "higher education," attending private flight schools, not actual colleges or universities.

Nevertheless, we are all willing to make sacrifices at our institutions to make America and the world more secure. I support the CVIS database, for example. But just because the new visa system flagged 15,000 international students instead of 1,000, I don't necessarily feel more secure.

Of the 15,000 international students who were

flagged last year, I don't know how many were students attending mainstream colleges and universities or how many were attending fly-by-night institutions. Of these students, I don't know how many visa violations were uncovered and how many were not allowed to enter.

1.3

2.4

Of all of these violators, I don't know how many were a genuine threat to our security. I can tell you with certainty that the five George Washington University students who had to miss a semester this year due to visa confusion were not a threat to anybody.

This year at GW, we skirted an embarrassing situation with one of our regular foreign guest faculty lecturers who was suddenly flagged and initially denied a visa from Germany, and was all the more perplexing since he had actually worked with our government on numerous occasions and had traveled here many times. Ultimately, he was required to travel a great distance to be interviewed at the consulate, where he was eventually granted a visa.

His initial denial did not make me feel more safe. It made me feel that the screening system was perhaps arbitrary and perhaps unable to distinguish a security threat from a bureaucratic confusion.

Frankly, I'm not sure he'll want to go through the

hassle of traveling several hundred miles just to get a visa to come to my school and teach.

I know it's one vignette, but I like to think that if we focus on one story, we have a face in front of us rather than merely a collection of data and statistics.

So, concluding, speaking as an educator, a university administrator, an American, a parent, I can say with certainty that the influx of international students from the far corners of the earth has made America and the world a better place, a stronger place, a more successful, more stable, more profitable place.

International education is a large part of the solution to national security and to world stability.

It's a large part of building our economy. It's a large part of spreading our belief systems. It is, perhaps, America's best ambassador.

So, as we seek to strike a balance between border security and economic security, I hope we can give the right weight to the benefits of international education.

I thank you very much.

1.3

2

MILESTONES OF VISA IMPLEMENTATION

3

By Marlene Johnson

4

Executive Director and CEO

5

NAFSA: Association of International Educators

6

Thank you. I'm very happy to be with you this

First of all, on behalf of all of us--there

7

afternoon.

8

are a number of us in this room, and those of us out in

9

the field in international education, let me first

10

express my appreciation to Janice Jacobs, Catherine,

11 12

and their colleagues at the State Department for all of

1.3

the efforts to help us get through this very difficult

commented. But I, quite frankly, don't want to think

outlined by Catherine earlier today. The Department is

very open to us and is doing its best to be helpful,

about where we'd be right now if the Department of

State had not taken the measures that have been

We have had a tough time, as Steven has

14

period.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

State has given you a set of numbers, and they do paint a positive picture. I think it's fair to say that part of the picture is positive, if we look where

we've been in the last couple of years.

and we appreciate that very much.

2.4

But I want to give you another set. In 2002-2003, the number of international students was essentially the same as the year before. It was up less than 1 percent. This followed several years of steady growth.

The data for the academic year that has just ended won't be available until October, but in the meantime we have surveyed a small sample of schools last fall to try to get a sense of how enrollments were going this year, and nearly two-thirds of the responding schools said their international student enrollments were steady or down this year compared to last.

I think the specific of GW is reinforcing that specifically. When the definitive data are available, we may see an actual decline in international students' enrollments for the first time in more than a decade.

The schools that responded to our survey reported that the number of students who missed their programs' start dates last fall, for instance, because of visa delays was up nearly 50 percent compared to the previous year. There were more than 1,000 missed start dates in the fall of 2003, just at the 232 schools that responded to that question.

The number of international scholars who

)

missed their program start dates was up more than 75 percent in the fall of 2003, compared to 2002.

We were concerned by these numbers, obviously. So in February of this year, we did another survey of applicants for the coming fall compared to the applicants for last fall.

The findings are that nearly half of the responding schools reported that international graduate student applications for this coming fall are down compared to last fall.

A later survey by the Council of Graduate Schools confirmed this finding. The schools reported that the "hassle factor," which many of you have commented on earlier today, seemed to be the biggest reason for this decline. People just thought it had gotten to be too much trouble to study in the United States.

So I think we have legitimate grounds for concern that really need to guide our thinking and planning for the future. Perhaps the State Department is correct, that our numbers will be up dramatically next fall. I certainly hope so. But all I can say is, right now there is no data to support that.

State is quite correct that other countries' strong recruitment efforts, which are leading to

dramatic increases in international student enrollments in Australia, Great Britain, New Zealand, and other places do have a lot to do with this. But I would submit, it is wrong to suggest that there is something separate from visa problems.

Part of our competitors' success is due precisely to the perception that there is a quantum leap in difficulty in getting into the United States. So, part of their marketing message is, come to our country rather than the U.S. and you won't have to go through all those problems.

The good news is, people at the highest level of our government now agree that America's strong interest in robust educational and scientific exchange is ill-served by a visa system that is currently in place.

There is a recognition at the cabinet level that we have not gotten it right. They say it every time they give a speech, and they have asked us for our recommendations for fixing it.

In your packet today, you have NAFSA's recommendations on actions that can be taken to improve the visa process. I hope you will study those, but I will just give you a brief summary of them.

We argue that a viable visa system which would

1.3

2.4

turn Secure Borders, Open Doors from a slogan into reality requires four things.

1.3

2.4

First and foremost, the Secretaries of State and Homeland Security must articulate an operational visa policy that defines the appropriate balance and that can guide the decisions of consular officers.

Second, such a policy must provide greater focus for consular reviews. The way it works now, you review everyone because you are afraid not to, and you can't blame a consular officer for that. So, we interview everyone for 90 seconds.

We sent every scientist application to Washington for interagency review, more than 20,000 of them last year compared to 1,000 per year before 9/11. Even if we gave an eminent scientist a visa every year for the past 20 years, we will put him through the whole review all over again in the 21st year.

People who go home for vacation or for family emergencies are put through the same review all over again before they can get back in.

There is no question State is making some progress in this area, as you have heard, but much more needs to be done before we will have a visa policy that maximizes U.S. security by focusing reviews in appropriate ways, while expediting processing for low-

risk visitors whose access to our country is important to us.

1.3

2.4

Third, for those applications that are sent to Washington for interagency review, more enforceable time guidelines are needed to ensure their expeditious consideration. Because State cannot control the other agencies involved in the process, we argue in our recommendations that the guidelines should be instituted by the White House.

Fourth, Congress must act to provide resources for the streamlined visa system that we seek. This means not only that State must be given the resources it needs to operate the consular system that Congress demands of it, but also that resources must be provided for the interoperable data system that a streamlined system requires.

I honestly believe, with the necessary will, we can fix this problem this year. It is a matter of turning our own leaders' statements into practice.

Virtually every one of the recommendations that we have made, or something like it, is being worked on by someone, somewhere in the bureaucracy.

With leadership we can get this done, but we need to step up the pace. Once customers habitually turn to other suppliers, whether it's in the

hospitality business or in higher education or the many other fields that are affected, it's very hard to get them back. It takes much longer to get them back than it took to lose them in the first place.

1.3

2.4

But that's not the end of the story. Fixing the visa system is only the beginning of the solution. Once we've done that, we must urgently turn our attention to regaining the international student market that we have been systematically throwing away for the past three years.

We actually were facing a challenge in this market before 9/11, and there is a paper in our archives outlining our concerns prior to 9/11. But 9/11 has certainly exacerbated it. Our share of the international student market has been declining for 20 years. It is a long-term challenge and we must address it with a long-term strategy.

In January of last year, NAFSA released a report of our Task Force on International Student Access. This task force actually was originally scheduled to meet on 9/12 of 2001, and we got a delayed start for obvious reasons. But that report came out last year.

It's called, "In America's Interest: Welcoming International Students." This report is also in your

packet, and I encourage you to read it. It calls for a national effort of government higher education partnership to attract international students to the United States. That is exactly what we need. We need a national strategy that looks at what all of us can be doing together from our own vantage point to make this work.

1.3

2.4

We are committed to working together with

State and Commerce, as well as the Department of

Education, to devise and implement such a strategy that

our report calls for.

I don't think I need to spend any time today, because Steve has done such a good job of outlining the case for international students, but I just want to say that, as you in the travel business think about your own strategies and articulate this, I hope that you will keep the student side of this equation very, very much a part of it, because I believe there are so many real links.

There are links between families who travel to visit their students who are studying here, there are people who come back to travel because they have studied here as students.

There are many more links that you will think of on your own as you keep these issues in mind. So,

1

MILESTONES OF VISA IMPLEMENTATION

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

By Leonard Karp

Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Philadelphia International Medicine

MR. KARP: Going last on a panel always has its difficulties because I don't think I have anything left to say, but I think I'll talk, anyway.

MR. KARP: Sitting here and listening, we talked a lot today about the balance between our economic future or our economic presence, actually, and our need for security.

I'd like to talk a little bit about my particular industry, health care, and the human element that we deal with every day. It's a little different focus on what we've been hearing.

I'd like to try to put a face on this by talking about two patients that have come across my organization. One was a 12-year-old girl, the other one was, I believe, a 54-year-old woman.

The 12-year-old girl was a patient referred to us from the government of Dubay, and had a lifethreatening disease. When our physicians at the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia reviewed her medical case, they thought that they could help

stabilize her.

1.3

2.4

Her condition was that she would be needing treatment for the rest of her life, but that they would be able to offer that and also work with her physicians at home in order to ensure she got the care she needed. In essence, her life should not be in jeopardy. This case came to our attention in February of 2003.

We set up an appointment for the patient to come. The medical office in the Health Ministry in Dubay went about getting a visa for the patient, and ran into some difficulty.

By the time she was able to get a visa, obviously a 12-year-old can't travel alone, so someone in her family had to accompany her. That took another six to eight weeks to get a visa for her elder brother. By the time all this occurred, her medical condition started to deteriorate.

The next step in this journey was that her condition had gotten so poor, that she would need to be air evac'ed to Philadelphia and a physician would need to accompany her.

Well, the local physicians needed to get a visa. By the time it took the local physicians to get a visa, the patient was no longer to come to Philadelphia and she died. This was a four-month

journey that ended tragically.

1.3

2.4

Another case was a 54-year-old woman from Saudi Arabia who did come to Philadelphia with her son. She was a liver transplant patient. Medically, everything went well with her case. She's back home now.

Her son, while he was here, took up English lessons, went to the community college, became an avid supporter of the Philadelphia Eagles, and in fact was seen wearing Eagles tee shirts and went to Eagles football games. He called us to see what happened in our game against Charlotte, and we had to tell him, sorry, it was a bad outcome.

The story here is that the patients that we deal with every day from around the world can be ambassadors. In fact, most of the patients we do deal with become ambassadors for this country back home. They become supporters for the United States for the rest of their lives.

The patients that we're not able to bring here can amplify the anger that is going on throughout a lot of the world. So we have a choice. The choice is that we can create ambassadors or we can increase the anger. I think we've got to deal with this overall issue in a more balanced way.

1 2

Let me just talk a little bit about the economic cost that we're seeing. International patient care, for the last decade prior to 9/11, grew at about 11 percent per year.

That was one of the fastest-growing segments of the service industry in terms of exports. Although we're in the middle of services, we reached just under \$2 billion in export revenue in 2001. Since then, we've lost about 25 to 30 percent of our market share.

Just to give you a little bit of what that means, one agency has estimated about 6,000 fewer patients have come here per year since 9/11. That 6,000-person estimate, for just the health care portion of their visit, would be about \$310 million. When you add on multipliers throughout the economy, it comes to over \$620 million. That's just patients from the Middle East that we're not seeing.

Now, there are many factors why people from the Middle East or people from Brazil aren't coming here today. Some of them have to do with visa security and visa delays. Others have to do with the overall global recession.

My own organization lost a training contract because of SARS, so that was another problem. There was a group from China that wasn't able to come because

of SARS.

2.4

The political environment that we are all facing today is another issue. But, of course, one key factor and key element is visa delays.

When we bring a patient to Philadelphia, the hospitals aren't the only ones who interact with that person. There are hotels, airlines, in-city transportation, interpreters, restaurants, shopping, cultural events, the hospital vendors, the people who supply us, support services, our own international office, the people who work in it and at international offices around the country in hospitals, banks, advertising and public relations firms, cable television companies that specialize in foreign language programs, architects, engineers. I mean, it's a huge support network that all benefits from what we do.

I want to give you another factoid that I found. Just look at air receipts from the Middle East, excluding Israel. In the year 2000, total airfare receipts were \$105 million from that part of the world. In 2001, it went down to \$20 million. In 2002, it was down to \$3 million.

Now, our community, the health care community, or actually the international health care community,

has done many things to change its focus and to react to the changed world that we deal with. We have all diversified our geographic focus.

1.3

2.4

In my own organization, our single largest source of patient referrals today is Bermuda. We are concentrating on the Caribbean. We are concentrating on Latin America, and we're building networks in Asia.

It is no longer the Middle East. I'm not sure that that will come back, although we have invited some of the medical attachés from some of the embassies here, and we're very happy to have you here and hope this message gets home that we want you back.

We have also changed our service lines. Many of us are concentrating heavily on education and continuing medical education and training events, and we're also entering into consulting and hospital management contracts overseas, so we're planting our flag abroad.

In some cases, we're actually getting patient referrals from our old clients and treating them in hospitals overseas. The result is that the marketplace that we deal with is stabilizing. We're not seeing the dramatic losses that we had been in the last two years. But we are nowhere near the levels of pre-9/11, so our base is much lower that we're working from.

1 2

But it's not only the patients that we're seeing having problems coming here. We also are seeing the same delays for scientists, for researchers, from one of my own hospitals.

Children's Hospital had a team from China who canceled—these were researchers that were involved in a project with our researchers and they really needed to coordinate with the people here in Philadelphia—jeopardizing a clinical program. One of my friends at Johns Hopkins estimated that it the loss is about \$50,000 for each researcher who can't get here.

In terms of medical residents, it's another area that we're facing considerable problems in getting people to either come, or once they come, they can't go home. The *Philadelphia Inquirer*, this Sunday, did a story that said 35 percent of the residents that are coming to the United States are arriving late, and about 12 percent of those are more than a month late.

Business relationships. I was astounded.

Talk about factoids. There are a million fewer visa applications because people just aren't applying. I think we're in a crisis situation. If that number doesn't wake up people, I don't know what will.

MR. KARP: This was referred to earlier, about

the Santangelo Group. Thirty billion dollars in lost business because of visa delays. You know, this was an industry-supported study, so if you divide it by half, it's still an enormous loss.

1.3

2.4

My own company has a partner in Saudi Arabia that we are having all kinds of difficulty getting him to come to Philadelphia for a business meeting.

And as has been mentioned from my colleagues in education, other countries are filling the void. In our own case, many of the Middle Eastern patients are going for care in Germany, in Britain. They're even going to Singapore, India, and the Far East.

The government of Singapore just commissioned a white paper that was issued last week. The essence of their white paper was that it makes eminent sense, now that the United States is having a drop-off in international patient referrals, for them to organize their program more.

There are other programs in Australia. The government of South Australia has an organized program.

Hong Kong, Thailand, Malaysia. They're all increasing their marketing efforts.

Another study that I saw was Asian growth rates. In Thailand, they're anticipating a 15 percent growth in their patient referrals from Asia. Malaysia,

a 30 percent growth. In the United States, it's a 5 percent decline.

1.3

2.4

Just some headlines around the world that I've seen. The Jordan Times says, "Killing the Tourism Slump by Investing in Arab Patients." The Medical Post, which is from Bangkok, "Asian Nations Fight for Tourists' Health Dollars." And Reuter's Health from Berlin says, "Arabs avoid U.S. for Medical Care and Look to Germany."

I'm getting the request to conclude. I guess
I'd conclude by saying, we were asked in a push-back,
what are we doing? Well, hospitals are doing a lot.
We are working with each patient. We're educating each
patient. We're working with them so that when they go
for their visa they're prepared for the questions and
the information that they need.

What we'd want from government, are several things. One was mentioned already, better customer service and training of consulate officers. I didn't hear, in one of your 60 procedures, that there was anything about customer service. Maybe there is, but you didn't mention that.

Many of these other points have been taken up by others, but we also need to do a better job in getting the word out, not here in the United States,

but overseas.

It seems like most of the focus of US-VISIT and sessions like this, how good they are, the audience needs to be overseas. We'd ask our ambassadors to start doing more to get out of the embassy and meet with the local press in their countries.

In our own case, to hold visits of the medical community. When we send a visiting physician and use the embassy for meetings with the local physicians, we need to put out a carefully transformed welcome mat that says that we're world class, our hospitals are world class, and we need you back. Thank you.

2.4

MS. BARRY: I would like to use my prerogative to make a couple of comments in light of the panelists' remarks. I think, just a couple of things that are common to everybody's presentation before we take questions and answers from the audience. I will be very brief, I promise.

First of all, there are not more visa denials in the post-9/11 world. The visa denial rate is remarkably stable around the world.

Secondly, when do you apply for a visa, particularly for business customers? Students are somewhat different, because I have to have a student

acceptance form from the university.

1.3

2.4

But for business travelers, what we are interested in is that they are a bona fide business traveler. We are less interested in where they are specifically going on that trip.

So if you engage with a foreign partner and you know that they are going to need to travel back and forth, tell them to apply early for a visa. That is what we are interested in, that they are a bona fide traveler, not that they're going to be in Atlanta on April 2nd for a meeting with Coca-Cola.

Third, several people mentioned screening problems. I'll be very honest. Part of the problems are related to the fact that certain nationalities have a lot of commonality in names, and if there is a hit against someone who is a threat to us simply because of a common name, it may take a little while to resolve that.

The system is much better. I don't think that the medical case of May of 2003 is representative right now of how long it may take to resolve a case simply because there may be a common name with someone who is of concern.

Yes, we do customer service training. We do want very much to be seen in our consular sections as

welcoming to the public. U.S. ambassadors do outreach, and we will certainly give them more suggestions on how to deal with issues related to travel.

1.3

2.4

And my last point is that, as you carry the message, you can either feed the perception that travel to this country is very difficult, or you can try and present a positive outlook that the systems in place are getting better and will continue to get better, and that people should not self-select themselves out of the pool of visa applicants.

I'll close on that and we'll take questions from the audience.

MS. JO: My name is Mir-Mir Jo. I'm the Director of the Credential Evaluation Service of ABET, the Accreditation Board for Engineering Technology.

I heard a lot of comments -- not comments, statements, about enrollment is down, and also the business is down and money is lost. At ABET, we see a different picture.

We have seen that in the visa process, we have seen TN H1-B visas were issued to people, to technical personnel, mainly, with the qualification that do not meet our U.S. requirements and ABET criteria. Out of the evaluations we have done so far, we have found over 50 percent do not meet the U.S. engineering criteria.

But these people, they were given visas to come in this country to work in the technical field, engineering field. Therefore, we are very concerned.

1.3

2.4

Also, we are very concerned about how foreign engineering degrees and credentials have been reviewed and evaluated at the university level. Now, we have found graduates with foreign bachelor's degrees, with U.S. master's degrees or PhDs. We found, when they apply for a license in this country, we found their documents were forged. We have many examples, but here I gave you one.

One student came in with forged documents and got into graduate school, and has a master's degree, and then later applied for a Social Security Service job and the person was caught. That's just one of the many examples here.

We also have an example of a foreign-trained engineer who came to this country and got a license from a state with a forged document, and then later it was found he was given the responsibility to inspect all the bridges in the state. Fortunately, we found the problem and reported it to the state board, and then his license was revoked.

So I do believe that foreign credentials, foreign degrees, should be carefully verified in

evaluating in industries, at universities, and also in the visa processes so we can protect the safety, health, and welfare of the public.

Thank you.

1.3

2.4

VOICE: I have a question for Ms. Barry.

First of all, I wanted to thank you for coming, and also thank you. We understand there is now discussion going on with Homeland Security about collection of the service fee by the State Department, and we're very happy to see that finally taking place.

A couple of things that we would really like to see happen that would help clarify matters for everyone in the tourism industry and in the education sector.

One, is to post on each embassy's Web site what is the anticipated waiting time for an appointment, what is the anticipated waiting time for a visa. Second of all, to post on each embassy's Web site what the rejection rate is for each category of visa. This information is posted on the Web sites of countries who are eager to have our students.

Thank you.

MS. BARRY: Let me answer the first part of your question. We do want to establish more uniformity in the information available on visa processing through

the Web sites of individual embassies.

1.3

2.4

What we're talking about doing in my office, is establishing, if you will, a minimum standard, listing the data elements that we demand that every Web site post and keep up to date.

Then to the degree that they wish to add more specificity about unique local conditions, that would be fine with us, but that there would be some predictability and uniformity in the Web sites of consular sections overseas.

We do not publish rejection rates by visa category, nor do we do it by nationality. We have never done that as a matter of policy. There is not now in the State Department a discussion to do so. We have found in our bilateral dialogue with government that it is an issue that aggregates the behavior of individuals.

No one is responsible for it. Governments can produce a new generation of passports. Governments can produce better screening at airports. But governments cannot produce better behavior by their nationals. So, it is simply the individual choices of a lot of people that end up being reflected in visa issuance rates or the failure to achieve a visa.

The failure to achieve a visa is so complex,

it ranges from terrorism, to criminality, to immigration violations, to the simple fact of not bringing in a photo when you apply. So, we have found it better not to get into that kind of dialogue with the general public.

MR. LONG: Let me intervene here. We'll be able to continue these same themes with the next panel. I'd like to stop the questioning for a moment, do the next panel, and then we'll be able to continue with this. Please bear with us.

1.3

2.4

MS. MORANO: I'd ask for you all to take a seat. Thank you, Mr. Karp. Thank you all for the first panel. It was terrific.

I have one housekeeping item to do because I was given this. Let's see. As soon as Jim Williams gave the Web site for US-VISIT, I was given the card on how to correct it and I haven't been up here to do this yet. So, I'm just doing it to show that I follow directions sometimes.

The site that he gave you was www.dhs.gov.

And Anna said put a slash after that, and then put usvisit and that will get you right to the site which has
all the information they've been diligently providing
on the US-VISIT program. Okay.

Now we're at the Policy Implications for

Conducting and Booking Business. I think this will be

a very good session to continue some of the dialogue

from the previous one, but also to open it up to, well,

5 how's it really working now?

1.3

2.4

So for those of you, by the way, that I sent to go to the cafeteria for lunch, I apologize. I was not aware they had changed the security laws on us here. So, see? Some of the communication can be inside, too. So, I hope you found a good lunch during the break.

I'd like to start with our moderator, Mr.

Alfonso Martinez-Fonts, Jr. I just wanted to say his whole name, because it's so nice and long.

Mr. Martinez-Fonts, who was sworn in as Special Assistant to the Secretary for Private Sector at the Department of Homeland Security on January 30, 2003.

So we've had him here for a little bit, and I think he's spent an awful lot of his time with the private sector enough for you to be able to have engaged in some conversations with him, some of you in this audience, at this time. He is charged with providing America's private sector with a direct line of communication to the Department, being done so

effectively.

1.3

2.4

He constantly works within individual businesses and through the trade associations and other non-government organizations to foster the dialogue between the private sector and the Department in the formulation of policies and the range of implementation that they are responsible for.

Prior to that, he had retired in April 2002 as Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of J.P. Morgan-Chase in El Paso, Texas. So before moving to El Paso, he had been president of the bank in San Antonio. He received his undergraduate degree in political science from Villa Nova University.

I say that, because I have an intern here working in our Department, as a matter of fact, from Villa Nova University, Lauren Brooks, and we're very pleased to have her. So, I guess it's a good testimony to caliber and ability to continue to moving forward. So, good thing you're getting a start with us here, don't you think?

Also, an MBA in finance from Long Island
University. We're very pleased that he was able to be
with us. He's the one with the plane to catch, so if
he leaves it's not because you asked the wrong
question. Okay?

Our first panelist that's going to be with Mr. Martinez-Fonts is Matt Bates. Mr. Bates is the CEO of Bates Consultancy, which was established to offer creative solutions to the travel profession and business development, sales, marketing, and compliance. They provide core services through publishing communications and training input to a wide variety of clients.

He comes to us serving in his capacity as the Secretary of the VISIT USA Committee-Europe. I have to recognize that there are over 35 people here who have come specifically for this conference from Europe.

Mr. Bates is also chair of the VISIT USA

Committee-U.K. Both of these entities, along with the

VISIT USA Committee-Germany and that of Europe, were

also very instrumental in the content and being a

spurring force for forming this conference, and we

thank you both for the ideas, the generation of it, and

also for your coming here to present the international

perspective, as is needed.

With that, I would like to at least recognize that we have a very multi-faceted package from our Scottish friend, Mr. Bates.

We next have Mr. Shannon O'Kelly, who is the executive director of International and Corporate

Health at the New York Presbyterian Hospital, and the university hospitals of Cornell and Columbia.

1.3

2.4

He is responsible for managing services provided to international patients, the creation of collaborative affiliations, and other types of international program development.

He's been here in this position for five years, having come in from 10 years at Johns Hopkins Health System as a manager of Strategic Planning and Marketing, and deputy director of International Services. Thank you for coming, Mr. Kelly.

Then we have Mr. Bob Vastine, who currently is the president of the Coalition of Service Industries.

This is an industry trade association for service companies and I think he'll probably give you a little more detail on that.

Prior to that, he had served as president of the Congressional Economic Leadership Institute and with an executive branch experience including serving as the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for International Trade and Raw Materials Policy, and as vice president of the Oversight Board of the Resolution Trust Corporation.

He has a variety of backgrounds serving on the Hill, and also as chairman of the Industry Trade

Advisory Committee for the U.S. Department of Commerce which is overseen by the Service Industries' Tourism and Finance Office. So, we are very pleased that he is here to speak on behalf of a wide constituency.

1.3

2.4

I just wanted to publicly recognize his wonderful patience at lunch as we set up yet another table, but was able to have a good dialogue with Assistant Secretary Verdery as a result. See? There are just rewards in everything.

For our last speaker on the panel, a nice new member of the community, the National Business Travel Association, where he serves as the head of that, the executive director and COO, having only just come on board in 2003.

But he has 17 years of experience in the travel and tourism industry, so it's not that this is a new area for him, having come in from being the senior vice president of Meetings, Education, and Member Services of ASTA. I think you did everything but be president of that organization, so there you go.

But he got his start, I think it is interesting to keep this in perspective now, in the travel business in 1986 as a steamship captain for the Lake George New Orleans Steamboat Company, and he still holds his Master's license as a cruise ship captain.

So, I think we'll let him steer the end of this boat when we finish on this panel. Thank you very much.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS FOR CONDUCTING & BOOKING BUSINESS

1.3

2.2

2.4

By Alfonso Martinez-Fonts, Jr.

Special Assistant to the Secretary

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

MR. MARTINEZ-FONTS: Helen, thank you very much. Good afternoon.

Let me start out by saying thank you to all of you for being here and for participating with us today. Let me thank the members of my panel for being with us today and offering their insights and advice.

By the way, Helen, thank you very much for pointing out the Villa Nova University part, and welcome to the Villa Nova student.

I'm glad you didn't focus on my James Madison
High School. My mother-in-law, who turns 90 this
weekend, went to James Madison High School, so I have a
very close connection to Dr. Trachtenberg here.

But what I'd like to do, I'm going to try to keep my remarks, and I've asked every one of my members to keep them somewhat short, because I think that the greatest benefit can be gained by the interaction that we have with the audience.

So if we tend to be short, it's not to get out of here in a hurry, but really to give ourselves the opportunity to listen to you, and also, even though we

have Captain Bill Connors bringing up the rear, Bob

Vastine has asked me if he could be at the end because
he says he believes he has a different perspective than
any of us and it will help round out the end. So, with
those housekeeping matters, let me just talk a little
bit about what I do.

1.3

2.4

I was very fortunate, as you heard, to be appointed Special Assistant to Secretary Ridge in charge of the private sector. I am in charge of the private sector office which was created by the law that created the Department of Homeland Security, and even though we are charged with seven things in the law--you know, laws tend to be kind of boring--let me tell you what I believe that I do.

Number one, I am an advocate for the private sector. I am an advocate for you. For all those of you that want to get in and make sure that we can get the right message and the right information to the Secretary, that is what I do.

When we play war games and the answer is, we ought to close the Chicago Airport, sir, because there's a spread of typhoid fever that could be -- it's like, Mr. Secretary, I don't think that's the smartest thing to do right now. Economically, that's going to hurt tremendously.

I just heard Secretary Evans earlier this morning speaking at another event, and he uses a term that Secretary Ridge uses as well, which if we don't have economic security, we will never have national security. So, the work that you all do in the business and for which I'm advocating for you is extremely important.

1.3

2.4

Secondly, we share two things. We share information. We try to make sure that information that is generated by our Information Analysis Group—this is our group that looks at the threats that are presented to this country—that we share that information with you, and that secondly we share best practices. What is it that travel agents, hospitals, or schools can do? How can we get that information around so that those best practices can be shared?

Third of all, we try to create public/private partnerships. We believe, at the end of the day-again, let me quote Secretary Ridge. He says that homeland security is not a federal issue, it's a national issue.

We could throw as much money as we want--and I hope there are no members of the Hill here that will say we've already thrown enough at it--and we could probably put more money into it, but it will never be

resolved with just money and just with the Federal Government.

1.3

2.4

Every American, and to a certain degree as I look around this room here, those of you that are promoting foreign travel, you probably want to make sure that every one of those foreign travelers as well is aware of it, that they need to be part of fighting terrorism, even in this country.

Finally, we have an economic analysis capability within our office that takes a look at, what is the cost, what is the impact, what are the effects of the rules and regulations that the Department is promulgating?

Let me switch over a little bit to a lighter topic. As I tried to figure out what it is that we try to do, ideal, you listened to Stewart Verdery this morning, you listened to Jim Williams. I don't think there was anyone here from Customs and Border Protection, but we also deal with trade. I'd like to just share a story with you.

Have you heard the one about the fast mathematician? There's an ad in the paper that says, "Fast mathematician wanted," and there's a telephone number right below it.

So this mathematician called the number and he

said, I'd like to apply for the job. He said, look, are you really, really, really fast? The guy says, well, I'm pretty fast. He said, look, pretty fast isn't going to make it.

We need someone that is really, really, really fast. He said, well, you know, I think I could be really, really fast. He said, look, not just regular fast. He said, look, just try me, okay?

So the guy says, okay, how much is \$22,387,609 divided by 18,608? And the guy goes, 24,307. He said, I'm sorry, that's the wrong answer. He said, well, what the hell did you want, speed or accuracy?

2.4

MR. MARTINEZ-FONTS: And the reason I share that story with you, is because that is the dilemma that we face today in America. We face it when it comes to cargo and we face it when it comes to people.

Do we want fast or do we want accurate? We could open our doors completely.

By the way, this applies -- I don't mean to liken people to cargo, but it could be for trucks that we just let in without inspecting or it could be for people that we just allow to step off the airplanes and not go through any sort of immigration, Customs, or other kind of procedure, or we could check every truck

that comes into the country, every vessel that comes into our ports, and every container, and every person as we interrogate them at the border, and we could, in effect, stifle the economic system in America and the terrorists would have won without there having been a single shot having been fired.

So, we need to make sure and we need to come up with the procedures that get us fast and secure. We need to make sure that people can get through the borders and goods can get through the border, but that we know that those people are people that we have confidence in that they're not going to hurt us or that the goods that are coming across are going to hurt us.

You're going to hear from this panel that has very, very diverse views on different areas. I told you we would try to speak and keep this thing short so you could ask a lot of questions.

With that, let me turn it over to Matt Bates from VISIT USA Association.

Matt?

1.3

POLICY IMPLICATIONS FOR CONDUCTING & BOOKING BUSINESS

By Matt Bates

Chairman, VISIT-USA Association - United Kingdom

MR. BATES: Thanks, Al.

_

place today.

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I can be really, really fast. But thanks, quickly, too, to

Doug Baker and his colleagues in the ITA and the OTTI

for facilitating this illuminating dialogue taking

with our colleagues in the U.S. Government.

The strength of our delegation from VISIT USA-Europe, 32, I think, in total, is an indication of how important we felt it was to come here today and talk

As I said, the overview that I'm going to give will be very brief, and I hope to the point. In fact, it will be something of a resume of points that have already been raised by my colleagues in Europe this morning.

One of our original objectives in forming
VISIT USA-Europe was to explore whether or not we could
forge a fairly uncomplicated and informal alliance
which would lend us additional strength in facing the
challenges that we have all faced since September 11,
faced in our national U.S. leisure travel markets, and,
of course, here.

In the wake of the disbandment of the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration in the late 1990s, the associations were formed and grew to the 50 or so that we have worldwide today.

They are all subscription-based, voluntary associations drawn from the airline, hotel, destination marketing, car rental, et cetera, world, very motivated and very prepared to put time into the effort.

We had, and still have, many very local market focused aims and objectives. We are diverse committees. In practical terms, though, we are each unique and fiercely independent.

But we also have a common mission, and that's to educate and motivate our national markets to travel principally for leisure, but also for business purposes, to the USA.

In forming VISIT USA-Europe, we were acutely aware that we had the potential to add real value to our individual market efforts. For two and a half years, our membership from our smallest market in Austria to our largest in the U.K. represents more than 80 percent of the total passenger lift from Europe to the USA. That is some seven million passengers out of a total of nine million from throughout Europe projected for 2004.

That nine million represents nearly 20 percent of the 42 million international visitors to the USA, so we feel qualified and we feel motivated to make our comments today and offer our input to U.S. entry development.

In most of our markets, we work in close cooperation already with the U.S. Commercial Service based in our U.S. embassies and with the Travel Industry Association of America. That's a partnership that's developing very rapidly and very strongly.

It's a reflection of the success, I think, of the VISIT USA committees that we are now working towards helping to pilot, as it so happens, in the U.K., the first major U.S. Government-funded marketing campaign.

That's, hopefully, going to be the model for a Europe white campaign, and who knows, perhaps for a permanent return to investment in marketing in the future by the U.S. Government.

Of course, the mutual challenge we're here to discuss today is a very different one, U.S. entry.

It's different from tourism promotion, but in our view in Europe, and in a very real way, it's the same. It's part of the same challenge.

We have to recognize the reality that unique

destination though it is, America is only one choice available to leisure travelers. Everywhere there are established long-haul destinations and emerging ones with much to attract those travelers and the money to do the job.

1.3

2.4

I wouldn't be here today reviewing U.S. entry with you if we didn't still represent a major player, perhaps the major player, in world travel and tourism. But if we don't get this U.S. entry part of our promotion right, who's to say how long we'll remain the player to target those other destinations, and who's to say whether or not we'll need to have another conference like this one in the future? We need to redress the balance between security needs and making travelers welcome.

In Europe, several elements of the evolving
U.S. entry structure are of real, ongoing concern to
us, and a number of them have been aired already today.
Hopefully, you won't mind if I just reemphasize a
couple.

Be sure that, firstly, I'm reemphasizing them in context of our unanimous view. That is, our support of a coherent and secure entry system for U.S. citizens and international visitors alike is not in question.

Safety and security, delivered to the best of human

1 **Final pages to be included shortly***